



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE EMPEROR JULIAN AND THE JEWS.

THERE are few characters in the annals of the world upon whom so many varying judgments have been passed as upon the Emperor Julian. Stigmatised by his Christian foes as the "Apostate," he has been held up by them to the gaze of the world as an object worthy of deep execration, and nothing has been omitted to impress this opinion of this famous Emperor upon the minds of posterity.¹ In his intense fondness for Paganism and ardent with the hope of re-establishing the religion of the ancient gods of Greece and Rome, with its temples, sacrifices and mysteries—a task in which he completely failed—Julian turned his back contemptuously upon the Christianity in which he had been educated, and under the auspices of whose representatives he had witnessed, whilst yet a youth, the murders of his father and kinsmen.² In spite, however, of the opprobrious epithet of "Apostate" having been added to his name by his opponents, and of the fact that he has been accused of being one of the bitterest persecutors of Christianity, more sober critics have arrived at the conclusion that, although he cannot be pronounced altogether innocent of having harassed and checked the growth of the new belief, he can hardly be looked upon in the same light as

¹ *Vide* the diatribes of Gregory Nazianzen and others of the Church writers *infra*. Cf. Lecky, *Europ. Morals*, II., c. iv., p. 262 (9th ed.).

² When six years old, his father was killed by order of Constantius, a staunch supporter of Christianity. His sole remaining brother, Gallus, was put to death in 354.

Nero, Diocletian, and other persecuting enemies of the Christians.¹

But, whatever be the opinion held upon Julian's attitude towards the Christians, all are unanimous in asserting his great friendship towards his Jewish subjects. His well-known attempt to rebuild the Temple has brought his name into honourable connection with Israel's history, which has nothing but the highest terms of praise and gratitude to bestow upon this heathen Emperor. As in the cases of Pedro the Cruel and Saint Louis of France, Julian is looked upon by Jewish historians through an entirely different medium to that employed by non-Jewish writers. So far from being the monster of iniquity represented by the Church Fathers, Julian was one of the very few rulers of the Roman world who extended the hand of friendship and good-will to the scattered race of Israel. He thus stands out in marked contrast to the two Christian Emperors who preceded him, Constantine the Great and Constantius, whose treatment of the Jews reflects no credit upon their newly-adopted creed, and leads the reader of history to prefer the heathen Julian to his Christian predecessors.

In his numerous writings the "Apostate" Emperor very frequently alludes to Jews and Jewish customs, and manifests an intimate knowledge of both the Old and New Testaments. This paper will therefore treat of:—

I. Julian's conduct towards the Jews, his views upon Judaism, and his acquaintance with the Old Testament.

II. The proposed rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem

I.

When we consider that Julian only wore the imperial purple for the space of one year and eight months (from

¹ For an exhaustive criticism of this question, *v. The Emperor Julian*, by G. H. Rendall, *Hulsean Essay* for 1876, c. viii. Cp. also Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. xxiii.; Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, I., p. 700 sq. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, c. vi., is far less favourable to Julian than Rendall, and is careful not to omit all the weak points in the Emperor's character.

November, 361, till June, 363, A.D.)—a brief period, in which he succeeded in making an undying renown for himself as a statesman as well as a warrior, and in the course of which he wrote his masterly satires upon the Roman Emperors¹ and upon the follies of the people of Antioch,² a large number of private and official letters,³ and a treatise against Christianity,⁴ the loss the intellectual as well as the moral world sustained by his death at the premature age of thirty-two may well be imagined. Those who are fond of speculating as to “what might have happened,” had certain epoch-making events *not* occurred, have ample field for their imagination in pondering upon the effect a long reign of a ruler of such powerful genius and vigorous energy as Julian possessed might have worked upon the rapid decline of Rome and the rise of Christianity.

Immediately on his accession to the imperial dignity, upon the death of his cousin, the persecuting Constantius, Julian proclaimed a general religious amnesty.⁵ He extended to all the inhabitants of the mighty Roman world, that reached from the British Isles in the West to Central Asia in the East, the benefits of a free and equal toleration. The various restrictions and burdensome taxes in favour of Christianity, that had been imposed upon Pagans and Jews, were with one stroke repealed. “Ye are all brothers one of another: God is the common Father of us all,”⁶

¹ *The Cæsars*, a satirical review of the lives of the Roman Emperors.

² *The Misopogon or Beard-hater*, a pungent satire upon the people of Antioch.

³ There are 83 of them. All Julian's writings are in Greek; the best edition is by Spanheim, Paris, 1696, with Latin translation.

⁴ Contained in Bishop Cyril's reply; text given in Spanheim and Migne Series Græca, vol. LXXVI. Translated into English (only 25 copies printed) by Thomas Taylor, the Platonist, 1809; reprinted by W. Nevins, 1873.

⁵ Ammian Marcellinus (heathen contemporary), *History*, book XXII., 5; Sozomen (*Ecclesiastical History*), V. 5; Socrates (*Eccl. Hist.*), book II., c. xxxviii. 23.

⁶ Cp. Malachi ii. 10: “Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?”

exclaims the humane Emperor in one of his letters, and upon this noble principle he acted, depriving the Church authorities of the power given to them by Julian's predecessors, of persecuting all who did not acknowledge their own party cries and doctrines. Heretics of all shades of opinion were recalled from banishment: Arians, Novatians, Donatists, and all the numerous sects of Christianity, who were only too ready to come to blows with each other and with the ruling Athanasian Church of Rome, were ordered to live peaceably together, on severe penalties. The Jews breathed the air of freedom for the first time since the days of Alexander Severus (died 235 A.D.); all the cruel edicts of earlier emperors, especially those of Hadrian (died 138 A.D.), were abrogated, and Julian behaved in a most friendly manner towards the oppressed race. He appears to have personally known many Jews;¹ in the famous letter² to the Patriarch Hillel II., he styles the Jewish Rabbi "his brother" [τὸν ἀδελφόν]. He is said to have established among the Jews of Palestine an order of patricians whom he named "primates," called in the Talmud "Aristoi." These men, who were of superior rank and education, were next to the Patriarch, and were entrusted with magisterial functions.³ The statement he makes in a letter to a heathen pontiff,⁴ that "there are no poor among the Jews," points to a close knowledge of Jewish affairs, a view that

¹ See his references to Jewish customs, *infra*.

² See Part II. of this article.

³ Thus Frankel, *Meba Jerushalmi*, c. i., p. 2:—מטובותיו אשר הטיב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל הוּא אֲשֶׁר הָקִים מִקְרָבָם חוּרִים דּוֹנָמַת הַפֶּאֶמְרִיצִיעַר בְּרוּמִי וְנִקְרָאִים בְּלִשׁוֹן רוּמִי פְרִימָאטֶעס וּבִירוּשָׁלַיִם נִקּוּבִים בְּשֵׁם אַרִיסְטוֹנִים. The passage in the Jer. Talmud here referred to is *Jebamot*, end of c. xvi.: "An Ariston asked R. Mana," etc. This R. Mana, argues Frankel (p. 65, *ib.*), was a contemporary of Julian, who founded this order of "Ἀριστοι. The "primates" are alluded to in *Codex Theod.*, book XVI., vol. VIII., §§ 8, 29; cp. Graetz, IV., pp. 385, 395. Graetz says nothing of their origin; cp. also Hamburger, *Real Encycl.* II. s.v. *Ariston*. Frankel's theory is a bold one and has very little foundation.

⁴ Arsacius was the pagan high-priest of Galatia; this passage is also quoted in Sozomen, book V., c. xvi.

will be greatly strengthened by reference to his anti-Christian writings. Gibbon's cynical remark,¹ that "they (the Jews) deserved the friendship of Julian by their implacable hatred of the Christian name," may have some foundation in fact; for the name of Christian and "persecutor of the Jews" were easily interchangeable in that age, as Church history itself proves. The climax of Julian's friendly attitude towards the Jews was reached in his desire to rebuild the Temple—which subject will be dealt with later. Whether Julian merely favoured Judaism because he was fond of all institutions and customs of antiquity,² as some critics assert,³ or because it was the parent and determined foe of the Christianity he abhorred,⁴ or because he approved of the religion as a genuine, pure faith, is a question that each writer must conclude for himself from the evidence before him. That he was possessed of a sincere liking for Judaism is demonstrated to the full, especially in his work against Christianity. This was written during the long winter nights of 362-363, and only fragments, consisting of about three books, have been preserved out of the original seven.⁵ Some seventy years after Julian's death, Cyril,⁶ Bishop of Alexandria, who was such a violent

¹ *Decline and Fall*, c. xxiii.

² This was a striking feature in his character. He approved of the worship of the Egyptian Isis and Osiris, because of its antiquity. For the same reason he restored many of the decaying cities of Greece, as Athens, Corinth, Argos.

³ *E.g.*, J. F. Muecke, *Flavius Claudius Julianus*, vol. II., p. 121; Giese-ler's *Compendium of Church History* (English edition), vol. I., p. 312; Neander's *Der Kaiser Julian* (English edition), p. 101.

⁴ This is the view of the Church writers, as Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Sozomen, Theodoret and their imitators.

⁵ Cyril himself says there were only three; but probably he only wrote a refutation to three out of the seven. Jerome [*Ep.* 70 *Ad Magnum*, Migne, vol. XXII.] states he knew of seven books. Socrates III. 23, quotes a passage that is not in Cyril's extracts. The Emperor Theodosius II. ordered all copies of Julian's polemic to be destroyed.

⁶ This Cyril (d. 444) is famous as the persecuting Bishop who expelled the Jews from Alexandria. He plays an important part in Kingsley's

persecutor of the Jews, wrote a reply to Julian's fierce onslaught upon the Christian belief, embodying in his polemic many passages from his antagonist's work. Had not this zealous Bishop thus taken up the cudgels on behalf of his creed, Julian's work might for ever have been lost, as no other version of it exists.¹

The *Essay* of the Emperor does not devote itself merely to an attack upon Christianity, but at the same time aims blows at the Mosaic books and teachings, especially at the narrative of the Creation. Unfortunately for the modern reader, we do not possess an independent copy of Julian's work, and we have thus not always a complete statement of the Emperor's arguments. They, therefore, lie under every disadvantage: the objections are presented sometimes in his own words, sometimes in paraphrases or epitomes, and appear to be so set forth that they could be most easily overthrown. Often we are left to discover what he must have said from the details of the rejoinder. Cyril was totally without humour, and when Julian was speaking in irony or condescending to prevailing weaknesses, Cyril supposes him to be giving his serious opinion.² We have, therefore, to be strictly on our guard in reading Cyril's refutation, as we know not what has been omitted and what is retained for the purposes of offering a reply.

Paganism Julian boldly and repeatedly asserts to be vastly superior to Judaism, but nevertheless the Emperor is not averse to praising the latter faith, which he declares to be in every way preferable to Christianity. The burden

Hypatia. His reply to Julian is full of abuse and invective, with a modicum of argument.

¹ Philip Sidetes, a deacon in Constantinople, is reported to have written a reply to Julian, in 400 A.D., but it is not extant (*v. Socrates* VII. 27).

² These sentences are an adaptation of Froude's observations upon Origen's refutation of the anti-Christian polemic of Celsus: *Short Studies*, IV.

of Julian's theme is, "Why have you, Galileans,¹ forsaken the ancient belief of the Jews, together with all its teachings and ceremonies? And if you saw fit thus to reject Judaism why did you not become Pagans, who surpass the Hebrews in religious truth? It is true that the Jewish Scriptures and Judaism contain numerous blemishes, which I, as a heathen, disapprove of; yet as a whole the religion of Israel is to be preferred to your newly-created belief."

The head and front of the offending of the Jews is, in the eyes of Julian, their determined belief in the Unity of God. Again and again he attacks this teaching, striving to prove the superiority of polytheism. He thus opens his subject against the Christians by stating, "The belief of the Galileans is a fraudulent fiction of man, without any Divine features in it. . . . Their creed is a mixture of everything that is pernicious in Hellenism and Judaism. From the Jews they have learnt impiety"² . . . (*i.e.* monotheism). In another passage he is praising the Decalogue; but of the second commandment he strongly disapproves, as being a "calumniation of the Deity."³ It is by reason of the fact that the Jews only worship one God that they are ignorant of scientific culture.⁴ But whilst Moses commanded the Israelites to honour only that Deity

¹ Julian never once applied any other term to the Christians, and according to Gregory Nazianzen, Or. IV., prescribed the use of this name by law. The name Galilean is derived from the phrase (Isaiah ix. 1) גליל הנגידים, "The district of the nations," *i.e.*, Galilee, where Jews and Pagans dwelt together, the latter forming a majority. Nazareth is in Galilee, and all the apostles came from this region; "Out of Galilee ariseth no prophet" (John vii. 52). Cp. note in Farrar's *Life of Christ*, vol. I., p. 65; and *Nedarim*, p. 49a, אנשי גליל קנטרין היו.

² τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἡ σκευωρία πλάσμα ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων, ὑπὸ κακουργίας συντεθὲν, ἔχουσα μὲν οὐδὲν θεῖον . . . ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν τὰς παραπεπηγυίας τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὥσπερ τινὰς κηρας δρεπόμενοι, τὴν ἀθεότητα μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ῥαδιουργίας, p. 565.

³ δὲ μὲν τῆς περὶ τὸν θεὸν φησι διαβολῆς, p. 737.

⁴ "Did they worship others, they would receive the various blessings to be derived from each, as wisdom and civilisation from Apollo and Minerva, valour from Mars," etc., p. 859.

who presided over their nation, he yet forbids them to revile the other gods.¹ The legislator of the Jews even told the people about the Aurrunci,² who are the gods who avert misfortunes, and whose wrath is to be appeased by the scapegoat³ sent into the desert. Other gods accompanied the Mosaic Deity when he went down to look at the building of the Tower of Babel. King Solomon himself revered other gods, and surely he was a wise man, argues Julian. But if one would say, he continues, that Solomon was deceived by women to worship other gods, then you must admit that that king was not wise, for no truly wise man will allow himself to be misled by a woman. Solomon adored other divinities by his own judgment and intelligence, and in consequence of being persuaded by the doctrine of God that he was acquainted with.⁴ In a letter⁵ addressed to the high-priest Theodore, Julian again vents his anger upon those people⁶ who will

¹ Julian bases this remark upon Exodus xxii. 28, אֱלֹהִים לֹא תִקְלֵל, using the translation of the LXX., which is probably incorrect, θεοὺς οὐ κακολογῆσεις. Cf. Frankel, *Ueber der Einfluss der Paläs. Exegese*, p. 130. The Jewish versions refer the word אֱלֹהִים to "God," or to "judges." Cp. Onkelos i. l.; *Sanhedrin*, pp. 56a, 66a: also *Masecheth Saferim*, IV. 5. Tacitus (*Hist.*, V. 5) differs from Julian, for he asserts that the Jews were taught to despise and insult other gods.

² οἱ ἀποροπαῖοι. Such were Apollo and Heracles to Greece, and Castor and Pollux to Rome.

³ The "Azazel" was, according to Julian, an "Aurruncus," a demon whom it was necessary to propitiate lest calamities fall on the world. Thus LXX. renders אֲזַזִּיל by ἀποροπαῖος=ἀποροπαῖος. See Gesenius, *Lexicon*, s. v., and Frankel, *ib.*, p. 132. The Vulgate (*caput emissarius*) and the Church Fathers generally, refer Azazel to the goat, which is incorrect, and contrary to the view of Julian and Gesenius. Many Christian authorities, as Hengstenberg, refer Azazel to Satan.

⁴ Page 841. (These numbers refer to the pages in Migne's edition of Cyril, *Contra Julianum*, Series Græca, vol. 76.) In his view of Solomon's polytheism, Julian is strangely in harmony with the advanced modern school of Biblical critics.

⁵ *Epistle* 63, Upon the Duties of a High Priest. All Julian's letters, *The Cæsars*, and a few other writings, have been translated by J. Duncomb, London, 1798, 2 vols.

⁶ The Jews are not mentioned by name. But, as La Bleterie (Paris,

only worship one God. "For those who are distinguished in the school of impiety," he exclaims, "are so zealous that they will suffer want and famine rather than taste swine's flesh, or that of anything strangled or even killed by accident¹ . . . But these men are in part only religious, as the God whom they worship, as we also do under different names, is really most powerful and most benevolent, and governs the visible world. They therefore who do not transgress the laws seem to me to be right. I blame them only for despising the worship of other gods in favour of their one God, whom they with barbarian pride and stupidity regard as their own property and hidden from us Gentiles."²

Whilst thus inveighing against monotheism, Julian, as will also be noticed in this passage, does not refrain from expressing his sense of reverence for the Jewish God. "Indeed, though I am averse to celebrate the festivals of the Jews," he says in his anti-Christian work, "I always adore the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."³ In his epistle to the Jews (No. 25), he asks their prayers for him "to the Almighty Creator of the Universe, who has deigned

1748), one of the chief writers on Julian, argues, none other than the Jews are referred to. The reference to the "swine's flesh," etc., is sufficient proof, beyond the contents of the quotation.

¹ Cp. Acts xv. 20, 29.

² τοὺς μὲν δυσσεβείαςσχόλῃ προσχόντας. οὕτω διαπύρους, ὥς αἰρεῖσθαι μὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀνέχεσθαι δὲ πᾶσων ἔνδειαν καὶ λιμὸν, ὑείων ὅπως μὴ γεύσαιντο, μηδὲ πνικτοῦ, μήτ' ἄρα τοῦ ἀποθλιβέντος . . . 'Ἄλλ' οὗτοι μὲν ἐν μέρει θεοσεβεῖς ὄντες, ἐπείπερ ὃν τιμῶσιν, ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς ὄντα, δυνατῶτον καὶ ἀγαθῶτατον ὃς ἐπιτροπεύει τὸν αἰσθητὸν κόσμον, ὄνπερ εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἄλλοις θεραπεύομεν ὀνομασίην. εἰκότα μοι δοκοῦσι ποιεῖν, τοὺς νομοὺς μὴ παραβαίνοντες. ἐκείνο μόνον ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι μὴ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς ἀρεσκοντες, αὐτῷ μάλιστα τῷ θεῷ θεραπεύουσιν· ἀλλ' ἡμῖν οἴονται τοὺς ἔθνησιν ἀποκεκλίσθαι μόνοις αὐτοῖς, ἀλαζονείᾳ βαρβαρικῇ πρὸς ταυτηνὴ τὴν ἀπόνοιαν ἐπαρθεντές. Spanheim, vol. I., p. 453.

³ p. 1045. Julian's pantheon was, indeed, all-embracing. Cp. Rendall, c. V. Origen, in his reply to Celsus, says, that by the proper pronounciation of the formula "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," miracles are wrought.

to crown me with his own undefiled right hand.”¹ Quoting the immortal words of Deut. vi. 4, “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one,” Julian applauds the sentiment contained in them as being somewhat akin to the Neo-Platonic idea of the One God, from whom all the other gods emanated; but unable to check that satire that is so marked in every one of his works, religious and secular, he mockingly adds, “if the Mosaic Deity is a jealous God, as you affirm,² why does he not stop the worship of all other divinities; is he not able to do this?”—A remarkable parallel to this question is to be found in the Talmud,³ where we read, as if referring to Julian and his philosophic school, though of a much earlier date, the following: “The philosophers asked the elders in Rome, ‘If your God is displeased with the worship of other deities, why does he not stop it?’ Answered the Rabbis, ‘If ye worshipped an object, the loss of which would not injure the world, surely God would stop idolatry and the worship of strange gods. But ye also reverence, as divine, the sun, the moon, the stars, and the planets, and shall he destroy the world because of the many fools in it?’” From the striking similarity in phrase and idea between the language of Julian and the discussions reported in the Talmud between Rabbi and heathen, the attacks of the Emperor upon Jewish mono-

¹ τῷ πάντων κρείττονι καὶ δημιουργῷ θεῷ τῷ καταξιώσαντι στίξαι μὲ τῷ ἀρχάντῳ αὐτοῦ δεξιᾷ. The full text of this *Epistle* is given in Spanheim, vol. I., and other editions; also in Graetz, vol. IV., note 34. Cf. Part II. of this article, p. 622.

² Julian quotes the words, Deut. iv. 24, “For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God,” and the Second Commandment.

³ *Avoda Zara*, p. 54b.:—אם אלהיכם שאלו פלוסופין את הזקנים ברומי לא היו עובדין הרי הוא מבטלה אילו לדבר שאין העולם צורך אין רצונו בע"א מפני מה אינו מבטלה א"ל אילו לדבר שאין העולם צורך לו היו עובדין הרי הוא מבטלה הרי הן עובדין לחמה וללבנה ולכוכבים ולמזלות יאבר העולם מפני השוטים ונוי. [These “elders in Rome” were R. Gamaliel II., R. Akiba, R. Joshua and R. Eleazer ben Azaria (about 96 A.D.). Cf. Graetz, IV., note on p. 121.]

theism appear to have formed part of the stock-in-trade of the polytheistic Platonists.¹

Beyond this unwavering adherence to the belief in the doctrine of the Divine Unity—a belief in defence of which the Rabbis permitted self-immolation²—Julian finds nothing but what is agreeable to Hellenism in the Jewish laws. The Jews had temples, sacred groves,³ sacrifices, lustrations, divination and “many other religious usages that require the presence of the holiest sentiments.” “Moses himself was truly religious about the eating of victims.” The Christians are sternly rebuked for having rejected the sacrificial code. “And if,” exclaims Julian in one of his sarcastic moods, “some acute Galilean among you might say that you are not deserving of blame on this account, as neither do the Jews now sacrifice, I will prove that person to be extremely dull. In the first place, you are reprehensible in that you no longer observe any of the legal rites of the Jews; and secondly,

¹ Cf., on same page, *ib.*, גמליאל כתיב שאל פלוסופוס אחד את ר' בתורתכם כי ה' אלהיך אש אוכלת הוא אל קנא מפני מה מתקנא בעובריה שאל אנריפס שר צבא את ר"ג:—*ib.* 55a. ואין מתקנא בה ונ כתיב בתורתכם כי ה' אלהיך אש אוכלת ונו The same terms, “jealous God,” “consuming fire,” are here used by the “Philosopher” and Agrippas as by Julian.

² *E.g. Sanhedrin*, p. 74a: — נמנו ונמרו בעליית בית נתזה כל עבירות שבתורה אם אומרים לאדם עבד ואל תהרג יעבר ואל יהרג חוץ מעבדים ונילו עריות ושפיכת דמים.

³ *τεμίμη* (p. 971). It is doubtful whether the translation of the word given here is accurate, because wherever אֲשֶׁר occurs in the Bible (*e.g.* Exod. xxxiv. 13; Deut. vii. 5; *ib.* xii. 3; *ib.* xvi. 21, etc.) the LXX. always renders it by ὄλος, “a grove,” an error in translation followed by the Vulgate and A.V. In Gen. xxi. 33, and 1 Sam. xxii. 6, where the word אֲשֶׁל is translated by “grove” (A.V.), the LXX. has ἀρούραν, “a tilled field;” Julian may therefore not be alluding to the “Ashera,” but to “tracts of land devoted to the gods of certain temples,” a meaning usually given to *τεμίμη* (*v. Liddell and Scott, s. v.*). The delight of the English translator of Neander's *Julian*, who rejoices (note to p. 101) to find that Julian has shown an ignorance of Scripture in saying that the Jews had “sacred groves,” is therefore entirely for nought. It is the rendering of Taylor that has misled Mr. Cox.

because in very fact the Jews *do* sacrifice¹ in certain peculiar ways, and even now eat everything as though it were a sacrifice, pray before they sacrifice, and give the right-hand shoulder² to the priests as first-fruits. But, however, being now deprived of a temple and altar, or as they are accustomed to say, of a sanctuary,³ they are prevented from offering the customary victims to God."

Abraham he declares to have been very skilful in the art of divination—a science of his own proficiency in which Julian prided himself.⁴ The vision of Genesis xv. is minutely described, and many encomiums are lavished by the Pagan monarch upon Abraham's skill in augury.⁵

¹ ὅτι θύουσιν μὲν ἐν ἀδράκτοις Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ νυν ἔτι πάντα ἐσθίουσιν ἱερά καὶ κατεύχονται πρὸ τοῦ θῦσαι, καὶ τὸν δεξιὸν ὦμον διδόνασιν ἀπαρχὰς τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν. The translation of Taylor ("in their own houses") and Spanheim ("in domibus suis") of the words ἐν ἀδράκτοις, gives no sense, for surely Julian could not have meant to say that laymen as well as priests among the Jews sacrificed in his day in their own houses. (But cf. *Adiyoth*, VIII. 6:—אמר ר' יהושע שמעתי שמקריבין ואע"פ שאין בית ואוכלים ונני קדשי קדשים אע"פ שאין קלעים ונני. Cp. Maimonides, *i. l.*, and *Zebachim*, p. 62a.) The word ἀδράκτος is to be derived from δρᾶμαι, and ἀ privative, signifying "that which is not usually seen," peculiar, unusual. The translators further give as the rendering of πάντα ἐσθίουσιν ἱερά, "the people ate all their sacrifices," whilst the Levitical law did not even permit the priests to eat every offering. The true meaning is as given here, "that the people ate everything as if it was a sacrifice." Cp. חולין שנעשו על טהרת הקדש, *Chulin*, 2b, and Rashi *i. l.* Cf. Art. by Friedmann and Graetz. [Baur und Zeller's *Theol. Jahrb.*, Jahrg., 1848, p. 338 sq. (not p. 260, as given in Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden*, IV., p. 369, note.)]

² These accurate touches betray Julian's acquaintance with Jewish practices of his time, *Chulin*, Mishna X. 1:—הזרע נוהג בארץ ובחוצה: לָאֲרֶץ בִּפְנֵי הַבַּיִת וּשְׁלֹא בִּפְנֵי הַבַּיִת. הזרוע זה זרוע הימין *ib.*, 134b.

³ ὡς αὐτοῖς ἔθος λεγεῖν τοῦ ἁγισμάτος (p. 969), corresponding to the Hebrew המקדש or בית מקדש, applied to the Temple.

⁴ Cp. Funeral Oration delivered by Libanius, his heathen teacher, ed. Spanheim, vol. I., p. 282; also *Misopogon*, p. 346; Gibbon, c. XXIII.

⁵ The misreadings of the Hebrew that are met with in the LXX. are almost everywhere followed by Julian. The idea of Abraham taking the auguries is taken from ver. 10, "And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against the other; but the birds divided he not." Jerome (*De Viris Illust.*, 57) men-

Abel's sacrifice was accepted in preference to that of Cain, because the younger brother "divided" his offerings more skilfully, and was thus better enabled to divine the omens. (These views of the Bible, as will afterwards be shown, are derived from the LXX.¹) God does not blame Cain even for having brought an inanimate sacrifice, which is the symbol of evil,² but because it had not been carefully "divided" for the purposes of augury. "So I was told by one of the all-wise bishops,³ but when I asked him how the division was blameable, he could give no answer." Julian examines in detail the priestly offerings of the Day of Atonement [Leviticus xvi.],⁴ and finds many things deserving of praise in the Jewish sacrificial ritual. He commends Abraham's wonderful faith in God, upon which he observes, "Full of faith was he,⁵ a faith strengthened by his knowledge of augury; and faith without truth is folly and rage; all truth must have some signs to attend it for its verification."⁶

The imperial philosopher is not sparing in his praise of the Jewish Scriptures, which he ranks far higher than the works of the disciples of Jesus. The laws of the Jews, he

tions that Tryphon, a disciple of Origen, learned in the Scriptures, wrote a tract upon the dividing of the birds in Abraham's sacrifice. This is not extant.

¹ The Hebrew equivalent of the LXX. (adopted by Julian) may be:—
הלא אם היטב תשא [תקריב] ואם לא היטב תבחר תחטא דום
Gen. iv. 7. Οὐκ ἔδν ὁρθῶς προσενέγκης ὁρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλγης ἡμαρτις;
ἡσύχασον. Cf. Frankel, *ib.*, p. 67.

² Philo (*On the Sacrifices of Cain and Abel*) speaks in similar language of these offerings.

³ Julian bore a fierce hatred to the Christian Bishops, and never let slip an opportunity of sneering at them. Cp. Neander, *Church Hist.*, vol. III., p. 77 (English ed.).

⁴ The quotations from this chapter are marked by many divergencies of reading between Julian and the LXX. (The latest edition by H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, has been used in comparing the LXX.) V. *infra*.

⁵ Cp. Gen. xv. 6; also Hebrews xi., Romans iv.

⁶ Some such sign was God's pointing out the stars (which, according to Julian, were the shooting stars) to Abraham. With this last passage Cyril's quotations from Julian somewhat abruptly end.

remarks, are accurate and venerable, and include innumerable precepts which require a most holy life and previous preparation. Although he is indignant that Moses ordains the worship of only one Deity, he concedes that his is a wonderful law, which is to be preserved for ever. The Decalogue, with the exception of the second and fourth commandments, he asserts, is obeyed by all nations.¹ He upbraids the Christians for declaring that the law had been abolished, and quotes against this view the words of Jesus (Matthew v. 17): "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets," etc. Moses, he argues, never hinted at or promised any alteration of the established law, and "the Galileans act presumptuously in ceasing to observe the Sabbath,² in not killing lambs according to the Jewish method, and not eating the unleavened bread."³ The Jewish dietary laws are commended,⁴ whilst the rite of circumcision, which Julian, in common with other ancient and modern critics, states the Israelites learnt during their stay in Egypt,⁵ is declared to be a perpetual institution among the Jews.

¹ Julian's division of the Decalogue is interesting. The usual arrangement adopted by the Church, following Augustine of Hippo, 395 A.D., is similar to that found in the Hebrew text. Julian's division is like our modern one. Cf. on this subject, Heilbut's *Decalogue*, 1874, and Art. in Smith's *Bibl. Dict.* III.

² The law for transferring the Sabbath to Sunday, the "Lord's Day," was promulgated by Julian's uncle, Constantine, in 321, some forty years before this was written.

³ ὡς μήτε σαββαρίζοντας, μήτε μὴν Ἰουδαϊκῶς καταθύοντας τὸν ἀμνὸν, μήτε μὴν ἄρτους ἀζύμους ἐσθιοντας, p. 1041. This reference to the "Shechita" strengthens the view, adopted on page 602, note 1, of the meaning of ἐν ἀδράκτοις.

⁴ In his Fifth Oration (*To the Mother of the Gods*; ed. Spanheim, I., p. 174) Julian seems to have the Jewish law in mind when he denounces the swine as unfit for food, as being subject to leprosy, overgrown with fat and short-winded; the pig cannot, even if it tried, add Julian, turn its eyes heavenward. This is also a purely Platonic notion. Cp. *supra*. (Quotation from *Epistle* 63.) The belief that swine spread the disease of leprosy is also mentioned by Tacitus (*Hist.*, V. 4.)

⁵ Celsus (2nd century) in his *True Word*, who also interlards his

Whilst thus lauding Judaism at the expense of Christianity, and attacking the Galileans for deserting the parent creed, Julian does not forget to sound the praises of his own Neo-Platonic philosophy, and to emphasise its superiority over the Jewish doctrines. Moved by his philosophical instincts, he compares, to the disadvantage of the former, the Mosaic account of the *Creatio ex nihilo* with that of Plato in his *Timæus*. Moses has omitted to tell, argues the philosophic Emperor, of the creation of the abyss, nor does he say that God created the darkness and the water.¹ As if suggesting a reply to some of his own questions, he afterwards remarks that some things, as the water and the land, had already had an existence, but were concealed until God called them forth. The cosmogony in Genesis does not speak of the creation of the angels,² or of any part of the spirit world. According to Moses, the Deity appears to have only been concerned with the material

attack upon the Christians with depreciatory notices of the Jews, goes even further than Julian, and asserts that the Jews were merely a tribe of Egyptians, following the occupation of shepherds. He may have mixed this up with the Dynasty of the Hyksos. Cp. Tacitus, *ib*.

¹ In *Chagiga*, p. 12a, it is stated that on the first day, heaven, earth, the abyss (תהו ובהו), light, darkness, wind and water, were all formed. In *Midrash Rab. Gen. I. 12*, is the following remarkable parallel to Julian's strictures on the creation:—פילוסופוס אחד שאל את רבן נמליאל א"ל—צ"ר גדול הוא אלהיכם . אלא שמצא סממנים טובים שסייעו אותו תהו ובהו וחשך ורוח ומים ותהומות א"ל... כולהו כתיב בהו בריאה תהו ובהו 'ש' ונ'. "A certain philosopher said to Rabban Gamaliel, 'Your God was a great architect, but he found prepared for him certain ingredients that aided his work, such as the abyss, darkness, wind, water and the depths 'Nay,' answered the Rabbi, 'they were all separately created by God, as the following verses prove,'" etc. Cf., from a strictly philosophical point of view, *Moreh Nebuchim*, part II. (especially chaps. VI., VII. and XXX.).

² Cf. *Midrash Rabba Genesis*, I. 4:—אימתי נבראו המלאכים ר' יוחנן אמר:—בב' נבראו המלאכים..... ר' חנינא אמר בה' נבראו המלאכים..... הכל מודים שלא נבראו ביום א'. According to R. Jochanan, the angels were created on the second; according to R. Chanina on the fifth day. It is, however, generally accepted that they were not created on the first day. Cp. Job xxxviii. 4-7.

creation being the adorning of the subject-matter, and did not call into being the incorporeal, the spiritual, universe.¹ How much nobler and more worthy of divinity, urges Julian, is Plato's doctrine of the Demiurge, which accounts for the creation of everything both in the spiritual and material world.

The Emperor further finds fault with the narrative of our first parents in Eden. Eve, he observes, so far from being a helpmeet to Adam, was the cause of his ruin and expulsion from Paradise. The Mosaic Deity was not wise in trying to conceal the knowledge of good and evil from mankind. The serpent, therefore, was a true benefactor to the world in opening the eyes of Adam and his wife to a consciousness of right and wrong. The serpent deserves to be reckoned among the holy beings of the universe.² Moses tries to prove that the confusion of languages took place owing to the attempted building of the Tower of Babel. This is absurd, says Julian; for not all the bricks in the whole world could ever have reached the skies. Even as a fable, resembling that of the impious attempt made by the Aloidae to storm the heavens by heaping Pelion upon Ossa, as related in the Odyssey,³ the Mosaic

¹ *Ib.*, II. 2:—העליונים והתחתונים נבראו בבת אחת העליונים ניוונים. מזיו השכינה הקב"ה בתחילה ברא עליונים, *Tanchuma, Genesis*, c. I., § 4, ואח"כ ברא תחתונים. The view of the Rabbis thus runs counter to that of Julian.

² This affection for the Serpent was the *raison d'être* of a Gnostic sect (3rd century), called the Nahasim or Ophites. According to this semi-Christian heresy, the serpent was Sophia (wisdom), mother to Ahamoth (חכמות?), and for having introduced knowledge into the world, is made an object of reverence. V. Neander, *Church Hist.*, vol. II., p. 146 (Clarke's English edition); Mosheim, *Eecl. Hist.* (ed. Soames, 1841), vol. I., part II., c. 5. Cf. the monograph, *Die Ophiten*, by Dr. Hoenig, published 1889.

³ *Odyssey*, XI. 315:

"Proud of their strength, and more than mortal size,
The gods they challenge, and affect the skies.
Heav'd on Olympus tott'ring Ossa stood,
On Ossa, Pelion nods with all its wood."—*Pope*.

Philo (*A Treatise on the Confusion of Languages*), some 360 years prior to

legend is inferior to the Homeric. The whole Biblical narrative from Adam to Abraham Julian declares to be on a par with the Greek fables. Moses says nothing of the origin of manners and laws; indeed the Greek legislators, as Lycurgus and Solon, were as wise as the Jewish law-giver. Continuing his comparisons between Jews and Hellenists, Julian contrasts Jewish valour with Pagan. Samson and David find their superiors among the warriors of Greece and Egypt. There is no man among the Hebrews at all equal to Alexander the Great or Julius Cæsar. In arts, political affairs, civilisation, and medical knowledge the Jews are far below the heathens.¹ The poetry of the Hebrews, of which in the original it is tolerably certain Julian knew nothing, cannot approach that of Greek or Latin literature; "although," adds Julian, "the depraved Eusebius² pretends that the Jews had hexameter verse and knew logic." Solomon, with all his wisdom (*σοφώτατος*), is surpassed by Theognis and Isocrates. The exhortations of the last named are much finer than the proverbs of the Jewish king. An impassioned outburst against his Christian opponents leads the Roman philosopher and monarch to refer to the condition of the Jews in the past and in his own time. "Why, being ungrateful to our gods, have you taken your belief from the Jews? Is it because the gods have given empire to Rome, but to the Jews liberty for only a very little time and perpetual slavery and exile? Consider Abraham a stranger in a foreign land! Jacob, first among Syrians, then in Palestine, and when an old man a slave among the

Julian, speaks of the same comparison being drawn in his day between the Tower of Babel and this Homeric legend, and argues for the superiority of the Biblical narrative.

¹ Chateaubriand, *Etudes Historiques*, II., part II., notes the similarity between the arguments of Julian and Voltaire against the Old Testament.

² *Preparatio Evangelica*, II. 5. Eusebius died about 340. The epithet "depraved" applied to this scholar, is a sign that Julian strongly resented his vigorous attacks upon the old Pagan belief.

Egyptians!¹ Moses brought his people out of Egypt with a high hand.² Their fortunes in Palestine changed more often than the colour of a chameleon They selected a king for themselves against the will of their God. They have always been enslaved, now by the Assyrians, then by the Medes and Persians, and at the present day by us!"

Of the Jewish prophets, Julian entertains no very exalted opinion. Inspiration he declares to be the gift of the gods and existing in but a few.³ It has long ceased from the midst of Israel.⁴ The God of the Hebrews was indeed great and powerful, but he has had very few good prophets or able interpreters of his will. The reason of this was, that these servants of the Deity did not apply themselves to science, and therefore only beheld the great light of Heaven⁵ through dark mists. Blind to the beauties of nature round about them, they were always shouting with frantic vehemence, "Fear ye and tremble! Fire, lightning, the sword, death!" They spoke only to the capacity of women.⁶

Turning to the subject of the selection of Israel as the chosen race, Julian denounces it with great warmth as being untrue.⁷ Why, he asks, did the Demiurge single out this obscure people for his especial protection and neglect the remainder of the world? "By what gods are the other nations ruled?" he enquires with his accustomed sneer, "unless some one should grant that the Deity distributed

¹ There is some confusion here. Jacob was never a slave. Julian must mean the descendants of Jacob.

² βραχυονι ὑψηλῶ (LXX., χεῖρι ὑψηλῶ). See *infra* for this Hebraism.

³ p. 801. Julian compares the oracles at Delphi and Daphne with the Jewish prophets.

⁴ Cp. *Yoma*, p. 9b: — זכריה ומלאכי נביתם האחרונים חגי וזכריה ומלאכי נסתלקה רוח הקודש מישראל.

⁵ Julian regarded Helios (the sun) as the symbol of divinity. Cf. Rendall, c. IV., p. 81, etc.; c. VI., especially p. 135.

⁶ Fragment of an Oration, Spanheim, I., p. 295. Warburton, *Julian*, p. 64, is doubtful whether the prophets here referred to are the prophets of the O. T., or the heads of the Jewish community of that time. The former is more probable.

⁷ P. 651.

them to the sun and moon?" Although Moses, and Paul¹ after him, taught the doctrine of the selection of Israel, history has disproved it, for whilst the Jews are subjects of foreign rulers, Rome bears sway over the whole world.²

It might appear strange that in a work professedly combating the Christian belief, so much space is occupied by remarks, complimentary and otherwise, upon Jews, Judaism, and the Old Testament. The deficiencies and shortcomings of the Jews that Julian laid his finger upon, were intended to persuade the many Gentiles who had become converts to Christianity, upon the rise of that new creed, that they had acted foolishly in attaching themselves to a belief based upon the Judaism in which so many failings were to be found. On the other hand, when bestowing praise upon Judaism, the Christians are reproached for having rejected a creed, which, although not so excellent as Paganism, yet contains many elements worthy of approval. But a suspicion seems also to present itself that Cyril, in whose works the fragment of Julian's anti-Christian polemic is embedded, in his personal hatred of the Jews, only re-published that portion of the attack that concerned Jews also, and wilfully suppressed much that Julian had written directly against Christianity. Seeing that Cyril only reproduces three out of the seven books we are told the Emperor wrote upon the subject, this surmise may be fairly correct.³ Against Christianity itself, the Emperor urges only such arguments as a modern Israelite would adduce to prove that the prophecies of the Old Testament have not been realised in

¹ Especially in the Epistle to the Romans.

² Similarly Celsus observes, "The Jews were to have ruled the world, but they have not a yard to call their own." Cf. Froude, *Short Studies*, IV., p. 418.

³ Cp. p. 1042, "All these things he (Julian) speaks of with many words. We (Cyril), however, only extract the sense of what he says, and omit the superfluous and useless arguments. It appears to me necessary that we should point out how opposed to truthfulness are his petty views, that only aim at rendering Christianity ridiculous."

the person of the Christian Messiah. Such well-known controversial passages as Gen. xlix. 10 ("Shiloh"), Num. xxiv. 17 ("A star shall arise from Jacob," etc.), the numerous Messianic verses in Isaiah—all are quoted by Julian to contest the truth of Christianity. The perpetual character of the Law (Exod. xii. 24), its immutability (Deut. iv. 2), the curses to be pronounced upon all who kept it not (Deut. xxvii. 27), that the prophet promised by God was to be exactly like Moses (Deut. xviii. 15)—armed with these weapons of religious warfare he stands side by side with the Jewish defenders of the faith of Israel, and combats their common foe, Christianity. Nearly all Julian's philosophical arguments are directed against the Mosaic Law and the tenets of Judaism, principally against its pure monotheism. His shafts of ridicule of, and opposition to, the Jewish Scriptures are drawn from the quiver of Neo-Platonism, and are reserved exclusively for this part of his subject. In his war against Christianity, he is at one with Jewish theologians, and arms himself with the same weapons, importing, however, into the contest a virulence and bitterness towards the creed of the "Galileans" that are a blot upon his manly and upright character.

From all that has hitherto been observed with reference to Julian and his views upon the Jews, their holy writings and their national faith, it will be noticed that the Emperor, unlike any other monarch who ever ruled the Roman world was very well acquainted with the Old Testament.¹ There is hardly a portion of the Old Testament that Julian does not refer to in his work. He must indeed have been a diligent student of the Scriptures, as he quotes them with great facility and ease as one who had carefully read and re-read them. It is quite certain, however, that, like the bulk of the Church Fathers, the version Julian used was

¹ Cf. his remark upon the eternity of the law (p. 991), "And this I can demonstrate not from ten only, but from ten thousand passages of Moses himself," a rather exaggerated estimate.

the Septuagint, and his knowledge of the original Hebrew was small, if any. Wherever a verse is quoted where the LXX. varies from the Hebrew, Julian's quotation resembles that of the Greek translation, and is guilty of the same errors. Numerous instances of this could be given, but three will suffice, in addition to that already mentioned in an earlier part of this paper, with reference to Abel's offering. Speaking of the verse (Gen. xlix. 10) which Julian says was fulfilled in the kingdom of Judah that ended with King Zedekiah, we read the following: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah . . . until those things shall come that are deposited for him." Julian here uses the exact words of the LXX. for יְהוָה, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ, as if the Hebrew read יְהוָה כִּי יָבֹא, the word יְהוָה acting as a kind of nominative to יָבֹא, "until that-which-is-his shall come." The conclusion of Julian's remarks upon this verse is also striking, for he says, "but you (the Christians) falsify these words and read 'Until he shall come for whom these things are deposited,' (παραπεποήκατε δε ὁμοίως ὑμεῖς Ἐως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὃ ἀποκειται)." Now, it is interesting to note that the false reading that Julian charges his opponents with using [which has as much *raison d'être* as Julian's own, probably] is, in fact, found in Eusebius¹ and Chrysostom;² whilst in the *Dialogue*³ of Justin Martyr with Tryphon the Jew, the reading of the same passage is discussed. Justin argues that the correct translation is "Ἐως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ (like LXX. in most modern editions, including Swete's). But the Jew replies, "I can easily dispute with you the reading you give of the Septuagint; for I contend that the correct reading is "Ἐως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὃ ἀποκειται." ⁴ The Jew here defends the very read-

¹ *Eccles. Hist.* I., 6. [Written some thirty years before.]

² *Homilia* 67 in *Genesis*. [Written after Julian.]

³ § 120.

⁴ Δυνάτον δὲ ἦν μοί, ἔφην, μαχεσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ τῆς λεξέως ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐξηγεῖσθε, λεγοντες εἰρησθαι, as the LXX.; ἐπειδὴ οὐχ οὕτως ἐξηγήσαντο οἱ Ἑβδομηκοντα ἀλλ' "Ἐως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὃ ἀποκειται. V. Onkelos and Peshito i. l. Cf. Frankel, *ib.*, p. 48 sq.

ing Julian impugns,—an almost certain proof that the Emperor had not read Justin's *Dialogue*, although it was written some two hundred years before.

In Genesis xv. 11, the LXX. reads for וַיִּשָּׁב אֲהָם אֲבָרָם, "and Abraham drove them away" (as in the original), καὶ συνεκάθισεν αὐτοῖς Ἀβραμ, "and Abram sat together with them," which makes the Hebrew have exactly the same letters but different vowels, וַיִּשָּׁב אֲהָם אֲבָרָם. Julian, following the LXX., bases part of his opinion of Abraham's skill as an augur upon this misrendering.¹

Another instance where Julian bases an argument upon an incorrect or doubtful rendering of the LXX. is the following. He is mocking at the custom of the Christians of holding services in the catacombs, and asserts that the reason they choose the vicinity of the graves is that they hope to behold visions, and receive communications from the dead there lying. In connection with this statement, he applies to his opponents the verse in Isaiah (lxv. 4), which according to the LXX. runs thus, Ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις κοιμῶνται δι' ἐνύπνια: "They sleep in sepulchres and caves on account of dreams."² Now the original text is quite different, "They remain among the graves and lodge in the monuments," הַיֹּשְׁבִים בַּקְּבָרִים וְיֹלְדֵי הַמְּנוּחֹת. The LXX. is probably a translation of this text altered to הַיֹּשְׁבִים בַּקְּבָרִים וְיֹלְדֵי הַמְּנוּחֹת. Had Julian known Hebrew and employed the Hebrew text he would not have taken this verse and applied it to the Christians as sleeping in catacombs for the sake of obtaining visions of the dead.³

We have thus ample testimony that the Platonic Emperor was ignorant of Hebrew, a fact that is to be regretted,

¹ Cf. Frankel's *Studien zu LXX.*, p. 214; and his *Ueber der Einfluss der Pal. Exeg.*, p. 13.

² Cf. *Chagiga*, p. 3 b, הָלַן בְּבֵית הַקְּבָרוֹת אֵימֹר כְּדִי שֶׁתִּשְׁרָה עָלָיו רוּחַ, הָלַן שְׂדֵים שִׁסְיֵיעוּהוּ לִהְיוֹת מְכֻשָּׁף, and Rashi's note, טוֹמָאָה.

³ The following is an incomplete list of quotations made by Julian, in which he varies from the LXX. (Swete's edition):—

in view of the wonderful intellectual powers, literary as well as philosophical, that he revealed to the world. As might be supposed, Julian considered the Hebrew language

	JULIAN.	LXX.
Gen. vi. 4 . .	οἱ ἀπ' αἰῶντος οἱ ὀνομαστοί . . .	οἱ ἀπ' αἰῶντος οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί.
„ xv. 1 (a) .	ἐν ὀράματι τῆς νύκτος adding הלילה after במחנה.	ἐν ὀράματι, as Hebrew.
„ „ (b) .	λόγος Κυρίου . . .	ῥῆμα Κυρίου=דבר.
„ „ 4 . .	φωνῇ τοῦ θεοῦ . . .	φωνῇ Κυρίου = דבר. Cf. Frankel, <i>Studien zu LXX.</i> , p. 67.
„ „ 2, 3 . .	After τῆς οἰκογενεῶς, adds the final words of v. 3, κληρονομήσει μέ, omitting the last two words of v. 2, and nearly all v. 3.	As Hebrew. For the LXX. of וּבֶן מֹשֶׁה בִּיתִי cf. Frankel, <i>Ueber der Ein- fluss</i> , p. 17.
„ „ 11 . .	ἐπὶ τὰ διχοτομήματα . .	ἐπὶ τὰ σώματα, τὰ διχ.
Exod. xii. 14 .	לדורתיכם; exactly like Hebrew.	Reads לְכָל דֹּרֹתֵיכֶם, εἰς πα- σας τὰς γενεὰς, cf. Frankel, <i>Studien</i> , <i>ib.</i>
„ xx. 5 .	οὐ προσκυνήσεις θεοῖς ἑτεροῖς, reading לא תשתחוו לאלהים אחרים.	As Hebrew.
Levit. xvi. . .	τράγοι=שעירים . . .	=χιμᾶροι.
„ „ 5 . .	Omits “and of the con- gregation of the chil- dren of Israel.”	As Hebrew.
„ „ 8 . .	At end is added, ὥστε ἐκ- πέμψαι αὐτὸν, φήσιν, ἀποπομπὴν καὶ ἀφειναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.	These words occur at end of v. 10 in the Hebrew, and run thus in LXX., ὥστε ἀποστείλαι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἀποπομπὴν ἀφήσει αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.
„ „ 15 . .	Omits “and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bul- lock.” ἐπὶ τὴν βάσιν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου is the rendering for עַל הַכֶּפֶת as if = אַל יִסֹּד הַמִּזְבֵּה which does not occur in the whole chapter. Omits last words ולפני הַכֶּפֶת.	As Hebrew. =ἐπὶ τὸ ἱλαστήριον. As Hebrew.

far below Greek, just as the language of Rome was in his eyes inferior to that of Athens.

His close acquaintance with the precise words of the Old Testament leads him occasionally into the use of expressions of a distinctly Hebraic turn. In telling of the departure from Egypt, he remarks, "Moses led the people forth with a high hand," this latter phrase from Exod. xiv. 8 gliding smoothly into the sentence, and imparting true force to it. A similar example is the following. He is inveighing against the Mosaic ordinances against polytheism, which teach "the worship of the one Deity whose portion is Jacob and Israel the line of his inheritance"

	JULIAN.	LXX.
Num. xxiv. 17 .	'Ανατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ 'Ιακώβ καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐξ 'Ισραήλ : omits דָּקָן.	'Ανατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ 'Ιακώβ καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ 'Ισραήλ : closer to the Hebrew. Cp. Frankel, <i>Studien</i> , p. 168.
Deut. iv. 24 .	ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ=יְהוָה.	ὁ θεὸς σου πῦρ=יְהוָה, as in Hebrew. Cf. Frankel, <i>ib.</i> , p. 67.
„ vi. 13 .	Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου φοβήσῃ καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις; adds לַבְּרִי.	Κ. τὸν Θ. σ. φ. καὶ αὐτῷ λατρεύσεις (Swete : Tischendorf reads like Julian).
„ iv. 3 .	At end, adds part of Deut. xxvii. 27.	As Hebrew.
Isaiah vii. 14 .	'Ιδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει.	'Ιδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται
„ xxxvii. 16	Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς 'Ισραήλ .	Κύριος σαβαώθ ὁ Θεὸς 'Ισρ., as Hebrew.
Gen. vi. 2 .	'Ιδόντες δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ=בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים.	'Ιδόντες δὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ (Swete ; οἱ υἱοὶ Tischendorf). Cp. Frankel, <i>Studien</i> , p. 67; <i>Ueber der Einfluss</i> , note to p. 25, p. 46, note to p. 47; Philo, <i>De Gigantibus</i> , reads like Julian. Cf. "On the Philonean Text of the LXX.," <i>J. Q. R.</i> , vol. V. p. 254.
Psalms xxxii. 9 .	Εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἐγένετο = יְהוָה אָמַר (reading יְהוָה אָמַר).	αὐτὸς εἶπεν καὶ ἐγενήθησαν.
Throughout the work.	Μωσῆς = Moses = (Latin influence)	Μωυσῆς. Cf. Frankel, <i>Studien</i> , p. 126.

(Deut. xxxix. 9). In a Fragment of an Oration,¹ he is speaking of the Temple "upon which his name is called,"—a phrase resembling שנקרא שמי עליו.

To sum up the conclusions arrived at with reference to Julian's treatment of the Jews and his view of their religion, we learn that, as being one of the creeds opposed to his rival, Christianity, and possessing rites and teachings that resembled those of Hellenism, he was very favourably disposed towards it. The monotheism of the Jews he disliked greatly, as well as their doctrine of the selection of Israel from among the nations as the chosen race of God. Well read in the Old Testament, and in touch with Jewish customs of his age, his version of the Scriptures was not the Vulgate nor the original Hebrew, but that of his favourite Greek, the Septuagint. His objections to some of the Biblical narrations are almost the same as every Greek philosopher urged in defence of his own theories. That he preferred Judaism to Christianity is quite certain; he saw nothing ennobling, nothing spiritual in the religion of Jesus, heaping epithets of opprobrium upon the founders of that creed, in a violently abusive manner that betrays his fear of its ultimate victory over Paganism. But above all, his worship of Zeus and the Olympian deities, with all the teachings of Plato, engrossed his religious sentiments to the utter exclusion of all other opinions upon religion. Had Israel in the course of the centuries been ruled by many another such "Apostate," the gloomy page of its history would have been considerably brighter, illumined by the warm glow of a generous tolerance and intelligent sympathy.

II.

PROPOSED REBUILDING OF THE TEMPLE.

Whether a serious attempt to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem was ever made by Julian or not, is a question

¹ See Part II., p. 628.

that has not yet been satisfactorily decided. The numerous writers upon early Church history¹ vary considerably—as they likewise do with regard to the character of this virtuous Emperor—and no two agree in describing or explaining the precise details connected with this question. Learned scholars, like Basnage² and Lardner,³ have denied that Julian ever really commenced to rebuild the sanctuary of the Jews, and have maintained that the whole incident of the failure of Julian's scheme is an invention of the Church Fathers. That the Emperor *intended* to rebuild the Temple both Basnage and Lardner admit,⁴ but that the intention ever went any further they argue—and in my humble opinion correctly—in the negative. On the other hand, Bishop Warburton published in 1750⁵ a volume of nearly 300 pages to prove that Julian did attempt to rebuild the Temple, but was providentially hindered. Grätz,⁶ Gibbon,⁷ Robertson,⁸ Milman,⁹ Cardinal Newman,¹⁰

¹ *E.g.*, Tillemont, Neander, Milman, Gieseler, etc. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, 1882, is completely silent upon the subject; the articles *Julian*, by T. Kirkup, in the *Encyc. Brit.* (9th edition), and in Schaff-Herzog's *Religious Encyclopædia*, New York, 1891, do not even mention it.

² *Hist. des Juifs*, VIII., p. 157.

³ *Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, IV., p. 47.

⁴ Both base this admission upon the 25th Epistle.

⁵ He was not yet a Bishop, and had not then written his *Divine Legation of Moses*. The full title is, "Julian, or a Discourse concerning the Earthquake and Fiery Eruption, which defeated the Emperor's attempt to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem, in which the reality of a Divine interposition is shown, the objections to it answered, and the nature of that Evidence which demands the assent of every reasonable man to a *miraculous* fact, is considered and explained."

⁶ *Geschichte der Juden*, IV. p. 371.

⁷ *Decline and Fall*, c. XXIII.

⁸ *History of the Christian Church*, vol. I., c. 3.

⁹ *History of the Jews*, vol. III. Notes to Gibbon *in loco*.

¹⁰ *Essay on Miracles*, p. 334, Oxford, 1842. Newman has admitted into his *Lyra Apostolica*, No. CLVI., a poem by Keble, the second half of which runs as follows:—

"The foes of Christ are gathering, sworn to build
Where He had sworn to waste and mar;
Plummet and line, arms of Babel's war,
Are ready round Moriah's field.

and other writers, whilst admitting that the attempt was begun, explain away the supposed supernatural occurrences by purely scientific means, and deny any divine intervention. The Church Fathers all agree in discerning the hand of God in the cessation of the work, each one vying with the other in detailing the number of wondrous miracles that occurred at the time. From a Pagan authority we have one account which needs careful consideration, as Ammian Marcellinus bears a high reputation for honesty and descriptive accuracy.¹ The people who were most concerned, the Jews, have maintained an unanimous silence, the only allusions to it being found in works,² the earliest of which was written in the sixteenth century, *i.e.*, some twelve hundred years after. These conflicting records, therefore, demand examination, and the various opinions upon the subject must be critically weighed and, if necessary, rejected.

All writers, ecclesiastical and rationalist, Warburton as well as Basnage, are agreed that Julian entertained the idea of rebuilding the Temple. Since the days of Hadrian the Jews had been prohibited to enter Jerusalem,³ much less to erect the Temple again. When abrogating all persecuting laws by his act of tolerance at the beginning of his reign, Julian also included this edict of Hadrian, and probably many Jews took advantage of this breaking down of the barrier that shut them out from their beloved Zion, and settled in the Holy City. Many

But the clouds that lightning breathe
Were ready too,
And, bursting through,
Billows from the wrath beneath ;
For Christ and His seers so keenly wrought,
They half subdued to faith the proud man's dying thought."

¹ See account of him in Smith's *Dict. of Christian Biography*, III. p. 484.

² *Shalshelth Hakkabalah, Zemach David, Yochasin*; see below. Frankel, *Meba Jerushalmi*, p. 2, agrees with the view of Lardner.

³ V. Graetz, IV., p. 168 and note 17.

are the reasons given for Julian's desire to see the Temple rise from its ashes for the second time, and his thereby manifesting great friendship for the Jews. The Church writers, as Gregory Nazianzen, Sozomen, and Theodoret assert that the Emperor wished to falsify the prophecy of Jesus (Luke xxi. 6 ; Matthew xxiv. 2), that "not one stone upon another should be left of the Temple." According to Socrates,¹ Cyril,² Bishop of Jerusalem, prophesied that now the time had come for the words of Jesus to be realised in their fulness. This idea has been elaborated in the play by Henrik Ibsen upon Julian,³ in a scene where the Emperor is disputing with Maris, Bishop of Chalcedon, upon Christianity.

Julian.— . . Then shall the churches of the Galileans be shut up, and his priests shall raise up this temple⁴ of the gods again under the lashes of the whip.

Maris.—Try, impotent man ! Who has had the power to raise Jerusalem's temple, since Golgotha's prince has called down destruction upon it ?

Julian.—I shall have the power ! The Emperor will have it. Your God shall be made a liar. Stone by stone will I build up the Temple at Jerusalem, in pattern and splendour as in Solomon's days.

Maris.—Not one stone wilt thou succeed in adding to stone for it is cursed of heaven.

Julian.—Stop ! stop, thou shalt see

The Emperor's love for sacrifices, and his being informed that only in Jerusalem could the Jews offer them, is taken

¹ Socrates Scholasticus wrote a *History of the Church*, 440 A.D., book III., § 20.

² This Cyril has written many works, but makes no allusion to this subject, see *infra*.

³ *The Emperor and the Galilean*, translated by Catherine Ray, 1876.

⁴ *I.e.*, of Apollo, that had been destroyed by lightning. The *Maris* of Ibsen is a blind Bishop of whom the Church historians relate many tales. Act III. a Cyrillus of Jerusalem is introduced, who utters the prophecy recorded in Socrates.

by many¹ as the motive for his intention to rebuild the Temple. Others,² again, attribute it to his general bitter hostility to the Christians, for by restoring the Jews to their former splendour and power he would thus deal a severe blow at Christianity. Ammian³ avers that Julian was desirous of winning glory for himself by achieving so bold an enterprise; whilst others⁴ believe that the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple was only an instance of the Emperor's resolve to signalise his reign by lasting architectural memorials, similar to the temples he rebuilt at Heliopolis and Alexandria for Egyptian Paganism, and at Antioch for Hellenism. Moreover, Chrysostom⁵ and Sozomen charge Julian with undertaking this work in the hope of afterwards utilising the new structure as a heathen fane, and converting all the Jews to his own belief. A yet further reason⁶ suggested is, that Julian hoped to propitiate the Jews, and thus win over to his side the numerous Persian Israelites who would, therefore, not oppose him in his projected campaign against King Sapor. Whatever stirred Julian to meditate the restoration of the sanctuary of the Jews, there can be no doubt that some such idea he really did entertain, and was quite prepared to carry it out. That the Jews themselves had propounded the scheme to him, and that it was in compliance with their petition⁷ is exceedingly doubtful, although some colour to this view is lent by the well-known friendly disposition of Julian towards his Jewish subjects; and seeing that so many temples were being rehabilitated, might we not

¹ Gibbon and Neander, following Theodoret.

² Thus Gregory and Sozomen, adopted by Newman (*Essay on Miracles*).

³ *History* XXIII. 1.

⁴ A suggestion by Rendall.

⁵ *Oratio contra Judeos*.

⁶ See Art. *Julian* in Smith's *Dict. of Christ. Biography*, II., p. 511. Milman, *Hist. of Jews*, III., p. 17 (5th ed.) If this was one of the many reasons that induced Julian to favour the Jews, the plan did not succeed, as we find the Jews of several Persian towns offering a stern resistance to Julian's army. Ammian, XXIII. 5. Cf. Jost, *Ges. der Isr.*, book XIV., c. ix.

⁷ As alleged by Chrysostom.

surmise that the Jews really hoped that theirs would share the general happy turn of fortune?

From a Syriac source of the early part of the sixth century,¹ we have an interesting narrative of the manner in which the Jews are said to have solicited the consent of the Roman Emperor to erect their sanctuary. When, on his march to Persia, Julian arrived at Tarsus, he was met by a procession of Jews who had come from Tiberias, headed by the high priests² of that city blowing trumpets and bearing with them a throne decorated by gorgeous images of seven idols. Julian at first refused to receive the priests and their gift, as they professed to worship only one God.³ The native Jews of Tarsus bitterly upbraided their co-religionists from Palestine for their irreligious conduct, to which those of Tiberias replied, that King Solomon⁴ and the ancient Israelites had also occasionally worshipped idols, and in order to attain the object they had in view anything was permissible. Julian at length agreed to give an audience to the Palestinian Jews; they readily partook of the unclean food of the royal table, and at the command of the Emperor sacrificed to the gods in his presence. Having thus propitiated the heathen ruler, they then presented the petition they had brought with them, in which they addressed Julian as "the King of Jacob and ruler over Israel,"⁵ who would revive the glories of the house of David,⁶

¹ Edited by Hoffman, Leiden, 1880, under the title of *Julianos der Abtrünnige*. Nöldeke has shown this document to be of native Syrian origin, written by a monk of Edessa, between the years 502-532 A.D. It contains many allusions, all tinged with malice, to the Jews. Cf. *Zeitschrift der Deutsch-morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. xxviii., p. 263.

² רבי כהנה Hoffman, p. 108; probably this phrase must be taken to indicate the Rabbis of that town. Tiberias was destroyed in 353, 10 years previous to this embassy to Julian.

³ How exactly similar to Julian's complaint in his anti-Christian work!

⁴ The same contention employed by Julian, *v. supra*.

⁵ אנת הו גיר מלכה דיעקב ומדברנה דאיסריל, p. 115.

⁶ ויתיר אתדנחת בכון מלכותא דבית דויד ואודדקת באידיכון רישנותא לאיסריל.

and prove himself their promised Redeemer,"¹ and humbly asked his permission to rebuild their Temple. Julian forthwith granted their petition and they departed.² Shortly afterwards, when the Roman army was encamped near Harran, the Jews of Edessa, some seven hundred in number, led by their president, Hymenus,³ stole at night from the town and made their way to Julian. To him they complained of the conduct of the Christian residents who had expelled all heathens from this most Christian city.⁴ Pleased with this friendship towards his Pagan subjects, Julian was not slow in consenting to the earnest entreaty of the Edessenian Jews, that Jerusalem and the Temple should be restored. But, grimly adds the chronicler, the Jews had no advantage of this promise, for as they were returning to the city, a number of Christian soldiers met and destroyed them; all their males in Edessa were massacred, whilst the women and children were dedicated to the service of the Church.⁵

ועל סברא דסוכיך יתב הוא עמן וחאר לפורקנכון איך גלינא דמן שמיא
דה וא על אבהין מן קדים..... ואתתרימתי קרנ ואתפתחא פומין על
..... בעלדרבין, *ib.*

² The continuation of this Syriac account of the rebuilding of the Temple is of great importance for the argument of this article:—"He allowed them to lay the foundations of the Temple; but then it happened, as the Scriptures foretold, that not one stone of the Temple should remain on the other. What further took place in Judea, others have described." Upon this cautious remark, Nöldeke observes pointedly, that in all probability the author had not heard of anything further happening with regard to the fulfilment of Julian's promise, and the supposed miraculous intervention was unknown to this Syrian writer 140 years afterwards.

³ הומנאס; perhaps the same as הומנונאס, or Hymenæus. A Hymenæus is named as a kind of Gnostic in 1 Tim. i. 20.

⁴ According to tradition, Jesus had promised Abgar, King of Edessa, that his city should always remain Christian and never be captured. Cf. Wright's *Joshua the Stylite's Chronicle*, p. 6.

⁵ Graetz, IV., note 5 to p. 371, who it appears did not know of this 6th century *Chronicle of Julianos*, derived his record of the massacre of the Edessenian Jews from the 13th century *Chronicon Syriacum* of Gregory Bar Hebreus, p. 68. Our *Chronicle* also narrates an expulsion of the Jews of Nisibis about the same time, that Graetz does not speak of.

According to Gregory Nazianzen, it was Julian who first suggested the idea to the Jews, saying that he had discovered from their own books that the time was ripe for their return to Palestine, and for the rebuilding of their Temple.¹ The principal direct allusion by the Emperor himself to his intention to erect the Temple is found in the famous Twenty-fifth Epistle,² which, in its entirety, all critics now admit to be genuine. As this letter has been referred to before, and is of considerable importance, I subjoin a revised translation of it³:—

“ To the Community of the Jews,

“ More oppressive for you in the past than the yoke of dependence was the circumstance that new taxes were imposed upon you without previous notice, and you were compelled to furnish an untold quantity of gold to the imperial treasury. Many of these hardships I myself noticed, but I learned more from the tax-rolls⁴ that were being preserved to your detriment, which I happened to light upon. I myself abolished a tax which was about to be levied upon you, and thus put a stop to the impious

¹ Warburton (p. 50, note) argues that the prophecy alluded to by Julian is Daniel ix. 27; but this is mere conjecture.

² Greek text given in Spanheim, I., p. 397, and Graetz, IV., note 34. In the first edition of the Epistles (Paris, 1566) by Martinus, the words *εἰ γνήσιος* (“if genuine”) are added by the editor. This doubt is shared by La Bletterie (a famous writer on Julian) on the following grounds:— (1) Julian calls the attacks made upon the Jews “impious” (*ἀσέβημα*), thus almost admitting their claim to being called a holy nation; (2) he relates “that he had thrown the delators (spies, informers) into the pit with his own hands;” (3) he addresses the Patriarch as his brother; (4) that the rebuilding of the Temple is promised to be begun *after* the Persian war, which all other accounts contradict. On the other hand, we have the evidence of Sozomen, who quotes this very letter, “Julian wrote to the patriarch and rulers of the Jews and to their whole nation desiring them to pray for him and the prosperity of his reign” (V. 22). It is only the remarkably amicable tone that pervades the epistle that has led some to doubt its authenticity, v. Warburton, p. 49.

³ Direct from the Greek text and compared with the renderings of Graetz, Jost, Spanheim and Duncombe.

⁴ *βρεβια*, transcription of the Latin *brevia*, registers, edicts (Graetz).

attempt to bring infamy upon you; with my own hands did I commit to the flames the tax-rolls against you that I found in my archives,¹ in order that no one might ever spread such a charge of impiety against you. The real author of these calumnies was not so much my ever-to-be remembered² brother³ Constantius, as those men who, barbarians in mind and atheists in heart, were entertained at his table.⁴ With my own hands have I seized these persons⁵ and thrust them into the pit,⁶ so that not even the memory of their fall shall remain with us. Desiring to extend yet further favours to you, I have exhorted my brother, the venerable Patriarch Julos,⁷ to put a stop to

¹ *σκηνία*, from the Latin *scrinia*, a chest in which documents were kept; cf. Becker's *Gallus* (English ed.), p. 332.

² *τῆς μνήμης ἄξιος*, "worthy of memory." cp. זכרוננו לברכה.

³ Constantius was his first cousin, and scarcely deserves this honourable mention. With reference to these remarks upon Constantius and his favourites, cp. *Epistle XXIII.* (Spanheim, I., p. 389): "We are now delivered from the voracious jaws of the Hydra. I do not mean to apply the epithet to my brother Constantius. He is no more: may the earth lie light on his head! But his artful and cruel favourites studied to deceive and exasperate a prince whose natural mildness cannot be praised without adulation." Cp. also Gwatkin, p. 194.

⁴ Grätz errs in rendering the phrase οἱ τὴν τοῦτον τράπεζαν ἐσιώμενοι, "welche eine solche Schatzung erfunden haben," which the English edition (vol. II., p. 605) follows by "who invented such a system of taxation." *τραπέζα* seldom bears the meaning put upon it by Graetz, whilst he has mistaken *ἐσιώμενοι* for *ἐστιοῦμενοι* (v. Liddell and Scott s. v.). The most literal and, at the same time, accurate translation is as here given and adopted by Spanheim, Duncombe and Jøst.

⁵ These informers (usually called "delators," the דילטורין of the Talmud) are the crowd of spies whom Julian dismissed from the court. The reference here is probably to three men who were especially noted for their infamous conduct, Eusebius, Apodemius and Paul, "the Chain." This is the view of Graetz, Warburton and Rendall, p. 153. La Bleterie cannot realise that Julian punished these delators "with his own hands," ἐν χερσὶν ἑμαῖς λαβόμενος, and hints that these words are an interpolation by a Jewish writer. Jews hardly knew sufficient Greek to attempt such a forgery.

⁶ *I.e.*, the grave, or "into dungeons" (Duncombe).

⁷ The generally accepted explanation of the name Julos (Ἰουλός) refers it to the Patriarch Hillel II., who held office from 320-365. When this letter was written, Hillel was about seventy years of age, and four years

the collection of the so-called Apostol¹ among you; and henceforward no one will be able to oppress your people by the collection of such imposts, so that everywhere throughout my kingdom you may be free from care; and thus, enjoying freedom, you may address still more fervent prayers for my empire to the Almighty Creator of the Universe, who has deigned to crown me with his own undefiled right hand. It seems to be the fact that those who lead lives full of anxiety are fettered in spirit, and do not dare to raise their hands in prayer. But those who are exempt from all cares, and rejoice with their whole hearts, are better able to direct their sincere prayers for the welfare of the empire to the Mighty One, in whose power it lies to further the success of my reign, even according to my wishes. Thus should you do, in order that when I return safely from the Persian war, I may restore the Holy City of Jerusalem, and rebuild it at my own expense, even as you have for so many years desired it to be restored; and therein will I unite with you in giving praise to the Almighty."

The excitement created by the receipt of this friendly and encouraging letter, and especially by the gracious promise of the rebuilding of their Temple, must have been tremendous, and the silence of the Jewish authorities upon the subject is all the more astonishing. But, perhaps, they had learned from experience not to trust in princes, in

previously had compiled his famous calendar (cf. Graetz, IV., note 22). Jost, *Geschichte der Israeliten*, book XIV., p. 210 (ed. Berlin, 1822), suggests that the Greek name is a corruption of 'Ιουδον, and is thus a transcription of the name Judah. In his *Geschichte des Judenthums*, book IV. 16, however, Jost agrees with Graetz, and reads "Hillelos." Cf. Hamburger, *Real Encyc.* II., s. v. *Nassi*; Zunz (*Namen der Juden*, note to p. 20) thinks the Hebrew equivalent for Julos is יוליס, as in *Sanhedrin*, 36a.

¹ A tax collected through an ἀπόστολος, פּוֹשֵׁל; cp. Graetz, IV., p. 305, and note 21. All Jewish communities paid this tribute in maintenance of the Patriarchate. Julian here advises Hillel to put a stop to its collection. Theodosius II. (*Cod. Theod.*, XIV., vol. VIII., § 29) put a forcible end to it altogether. The Talmud knows nothing of it. Cp. Milman, *History of the Jews*, III., p. 38 (fifth edition).

spite of Julian's amity During the reign of Trajan, it is related in the Midrash,¹ in the days of R. Joshua b. Chananya, permission had been given by the government to rebuild the Temple, but owing to the intervention of some Cutheans (probably Christians² are alluded to), the scheme had to be abandoned. Whether it was the memory of this abortive attempt that caused the Jews to omit all reference to this imperial missive or not, it is certainly remarkable that the Talmud is completely silent upon the matter.³ Jerome⁴ relates that the Jews applied to Julian the following verse (Daniel xi. 34), "Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help." This verse could certainly be taken to describe the lull in the storm of persecution the Jews experienced under Julian's brief reign, but no Jewish source has preserved this tradition in any way. Again, the coming of the Messiah and the restoration of the Temple were events that were to be contemporaneous, according to Jewish teaching, and surely the Jews would not regard a Roman emperor, however gracious, as their promised Redeemer.

It may here not be out of place to inquire into the reason of this silence of Jewish literature upon Julian. Surely, if he was so wonderfully well disposed towards the Jews, they would have gratefully recorded this rare friend-

¹ *Bereshith Rabba*, c. LXIV (*Toldoth*). V. Graetz, IV., p. 142, and note 14. Zunz, *Gott. Vortr.*, p. 186 (ed. by Dr. Brüll), believes this Midrash to refer to the proposed restoration under Julian, which Graetz denies.

² כוּתָּאִי. So thinks Zunz. In *Shalsheleth Hakkabalah*, p. 89b (ed. Amsterdam), it is distinctly said, הַנּוֹצְרִים חֲשַׁדְדוּ עִם הַקִּיסָר וּבָטַל הַנּוֹרָה.

³ The very name of Julian never occurs in Talmudic writings. In *Jer. Nedarim*, III. 37d., the words לִיְלִינוּס מַלְכָּא ("the King Lulinus"), which Zunz (*Gott. Vortr.*, p. 56) thinks should read יוֹלִינוּס (Julinus), are explained by Graetz and others to be a corruption of דְּיוֹקְלוֹטִיָּנוּס (Diocletianus). Julian (לִיְלִיָּנִי) was a Jewish name sometimes exchanged for Reuben, as Rufus for Judah, etc. *Midrash Rabba Levit.* c. XXXII. Mentioned by R. Huna (end 3rd century).

⁴ *Commentar. in Daniele* xi. 34.

ship in some manner or the other. When, however, we consider the condition of the Jews and of Jewish studies at the time, all surprise disappears. In the first place, the reign of Julian was very short, and before any mention of him could be inserted in the Jerusalem Talmud¹ or other works, the power of the Christians under his successors, Jovian and Valentinian, again rose to a height, and fearful of giving offence by lavishing praise upon the "Apostate" Emperor, the Jews were compelled to remain silent and omit all reference to him. It is hardly to be expected that the Jews of Babylon or their Talmud should tell of Julian's friendliness for their co-religionists, since, as the subjects of the Persian king, and even taking up arms against the Roman monarch,² the Babylonian Jews were patriotic enough to regard him as the enemy of their king and country. Again, the schools of Palestine, who could alone have spoken of Julian, were at this time in a state of rapid decay, all literary production was at a standstill, and the seat of Jewish erudition had already been transferred to the banks of the Euphrates.³ An English scholar has, however, striven to enunciate the view that the Jews of the period really did make honourable mention of Julian, but on examination his reference loses all weight,⁴ and the silence on the part of the Jews still remains unbroken.

¹ This, too, was already probably closed; cf. Frankel, *Meba Jerushalmi*, c. i., p. 2b., ולא ארכו הימים אחרי מות יוליאנוס ונחתם תלמוד ירושלמי.

² Ammian Marc. XXIII. 5.

³ Cf. Graetz, IV., c. XXII.; Frankel, *ib.*

⁴ Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, c. VI., p. 203. "The heathens mocked, the Christians cursed, and Israel alone remembered Julian for good. Treasured in the house of Julianus Cæsar, the vessels of the Temple still await the day when Messiah ben Ephraim shall take them thence." The passage here alluded to, גנוזים בבית יוליאנוס קיסר, Mr. Gwatkin says he "has seen somewhere, but it is not mentioned by Graetz." Perhaps it was in Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judentum*, II. p. 703, where the Cambridge Professor read these words. They are taken from a small apocalyptic Midrash, called אבות המשיח (given in full in Jellinek's *Beth Hamidrash*, II., p. 60), but are of little importance for two reasons: 1. The passage is at the earliest of the 9th century, or probably later; v. Hamburger, *Real. Encycl.*

Thus far, we are treading on safe ground. The letter of Julian is positive proof of his intention to rebuild the Temple. From its statement, that "on his safe return from the Persian war," he would restore Jerusalem, we

II., *s.v.* "Armilus." and further on in this note. 2. The phrase גִּנְזִים וְנִי, so far from being a method of "remembering any one for good," has quite the contrary meaning. The usual Talmudic sense of גִּנְזִים is, to conceal out of sight for a bad purpose, to treat with contumely. Thus גִּנְזִים מִי יְחֻקֵּל Sabbath, p. 13b; מִשְׁנַנְנוּ הָאָרֶץ וְנִי, Yoma, p. 52b; v. Levy, *Neues Chal. Wört. s.v.* The phrase is also used in reference to the holy vessels being hidden away by the Babylonian conquerors of the first Temple—surely in no laudatory sense. The real sense of Mr. Gwatkin's quotation is, that Julian the Emperor had *stolen* away from Israel, even as Nebuchadnezzar and Titus before him, the sacred vessels of the Sanctuary, and when the Redeemer would come, these vessels would all be restored. It can thus hardly be maintained that the Jews "remembered Julian for good" in this passage, or that this quotation is a contemporary record.—The *אֲוֹתוֹת הַמְּשִׁיחַ*, "Ten Signs of the Messianic Age," were, till recently, thought to have first been written down by R. Machir (flourished c. 1375) in his *Avkath Rochel*. From this work, which Antonius Hulsius translated into Latin, with exhaustive notes, in 1653, Eisenmenger, *l.c.*, and Allen's *Modern Judaism*, p. 262, *sq.*, extracted their quotations. (Cp. Wolff, *Bibl. Rab.* I., p. 760, and Steinschneider's *Catalogue*, p. 1640.) However, in the MS. עֵץ חַיִּים by R. Jacob ben Judah of London, which Prof. Kauffman has shown to be of about 1287 (*v. J. Q. R.*, vol. IV., Nos. 13 and 16), these Ten Signs are given exactly as in the *Abkath Rochel* (v. הַלְכוֹת הַמְּשִׁיחַ, p. 891). R. Jacob of London says that his authority for these Ten Signs is R. Hai Gaon (flourished about 1000 A.D. : "וְהַעֲתִיקָתִי" אֲוֹתוֹת מִמְּדַרְשֵׁי רַב הָאֵל גָּאֹן. None of Hai Gaon's known works contains these *אֲוֹתוֹת הַמְּשִׁיחַ*, although in one of his *Responsa* he details certain Messianic signs and portents, that are totally different to those given by R. Jacob (*v. Ashkenazi's* טַעַם וְקִנְיָם (Frankf.-a-Maine, 1854), p. 59, *sq.*)—Whilst speaking of Mr. Gwatkin's work, attention may be called to his observations upon the moral condition of the Jews at that period (c. III., p. 59). The character of the Jews is painted as black as it possibly could be, and the evidence quoted in support of this perverted view is that of Chrysostom, a bitter antagonist of the Jewish race. As well accept the evidence of a bigoted Jesuit as to the corrupt condition of the established Church of England!—In one of the recensions of the legend of the "Ten Martyrs," עֲשֶׂרָה הַרוּנֵי מַלְכוּת (given in *Beth Hamidrash*, VI., p. 31), Julian (לֹּוֹלִיאָנוֹס) thus also written sometimes in Syriac) is mentioned as being the persecuting Emperor. But this reference is also of no value, as being later than the ninth century and purely fictitious.

are forced to conclude that as he died during the war, the attempt never went any further. All authorities agree that the famous letter was written about six months before Julian's sudden death,¹ and did we possess no other document upon this question of the Temple than this epistle, we should have no hesitation in believing that the work was never begun. Let us, therefore, see how it is that an opinion is current, even among most cautious critics of history, that the rebuilding of the Temple was commenced, and owing to certain strange causes was unexpectedly interrupted. I will strive to prove that the whole affair of the preternatural interference, or be it only natural, that caused the attempt to be abandoned, is based on *one writer's assertion*, a writer whose credibility it will be imperative to certify before we can believe his narrative. Taking the arguments in proof of the event urged by Warburton,² we will in turn examine the evidence of (A.) Julian himself, (B.) of Christian records, (C.) of the heathen writer, Ammian Marcellinus, and (D.) of the Jewish historians.

(A.) Among the writings of Julian, there is extant a fragment of an Oration,³ in which the Emperor formulates a scheme for re-establishing the worship of the gods with all its sacrifices and shrines, as a rival to Christianity. In a passage where he is justifying the gods for suffering their temples and images to be treated with contumely by their enemies, both Christians and others, he exclaims,⁴ "As for the prophets of the Jews, who so much upbraid us with

¹ June, 363. He was killed in battle, some say by a Christian.

² Page 54 *sq.* Warburton was moved to this elaborate defence by the criticisms of Basnage. Jost, *Gesch. der Isr.*, book XIV., note 40, also offers a feeble reply to the same writer.

³ This fragment was first printed by D. Petau, 1630, and is given in Spanheim, p. 295.

⁴ Οἱ γὰρ ὀνειδίζοντες ἡμῖν τοιαῦτα τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ προφῆται τί περὶ τοῦ νέω φήσουσι, τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦς τρίτον ἀνατραπέντος, ἐγειρομένου δὲ οὐδὲ νῦν; ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπον οὐκ ὀνειδίζων ἐκείνοις, ὅς γε τοσοῦτοις ὕστερον χρόνοις ἀναστήσασθαι διειροήθησαν αὐτὸν εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ κληθέντος ἐπ' αὐτῷ θεοῦ.

these disasters, what will they say to their own Temple, that has been destroyed for a third time, and has not even yet been raised up? I say this not to upbraid them, for I myself, after so long a period, intended to rebuild it to the honour of the God called thereby."¹

Now, without straining any of the words of this noteworthy passage, as Warburton with wasted ingenuity does, we have simply a statement that Julian had meant to rebuild the Temple, but circumstances had prevented him. When we remember, moreover, that this Oration was written at the same time as the work against Christianity, that is, during the Persian campaign, we have but a further proof of the theory that owing to the stress of the war, the plan to restore Jerusalem had not yet proceeded any further than intimated in the epistle to the Jews. It was even then, during the war, a promise and nothing further. The argument adduced by Fabricius,² La Bleterie and others from the words "for a third time destroyed," as if the double destruction of the Temple and the failure of Julian's own venture were alluded to,³ is cleverly disposed of by Warburton himself.⁴ The testimony of the Emperor, there-

¹ Or "whose (name) is called upon it," cp. שְׁמֵהּ עָלָיו. See *supra*.

² In his *Lux Evangelii*, c. XIV.

³ Mr. J. Fergusson, the architect (*Temples of the Jews*, p. 184), affirms that the work was really begun, and the fragment of a frontispiece attached to the Herodian work of the Huldah gateway, four pillars standing in the gateway below, and some of the alterations in the domed hall beneath, are all relics of Julian's attempt. The evidence adduced to prove this assertion is extremely slight.

⁴ Thus—1. Defeating an attempt to rebuild cannot, by any known figure of speech, be called the overthrow of a building. 2. The words "that has not even yet been raised up," can hardly be used of a building destroyed only two months before. The "three" subversions are by Nebuchadnezzar, Herod (in rebuilding Nehemiah's Temple), and by Titus. According to others, the profanation by Antiochus Epiphanes may be reckoned instead of that by Herod. Lardner (*Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, vol. IV.) counts the final levelling of the Temple site by Hadrian as the third subversion. Upon this cf. Renan, *Hist. des Origines du Christ.*, vol. VI., Appendix I.

fore, that the work was ever commenced, is of no value, as the simple sense of the quotation here given is opposed to any such view. Warburton attempts to explain the discrepancy between Julian's own statement—as given in the letter to the Patriarch and in this Oration—and the circumstantial narratives of the various historians, by supposing that whilst it is true that the Emperor contemplated the rebuilding *after* the war, yet finding his attacks upon Christianity did not succeed, "he grew enraged at his defeat, and resolved to put this last effort of his malice in immediate execution" before going to Persia.

This suggestion is an easy way out of a grave difficulty, but its very simplicity betrays its doubtful character. As a persecutor of the Christians, Julian was milder than the Christians of his age ever were to the Pagans; in fact, his generous tolerance, that deprived his religious foes of earning the title and glory of martyrdom, was a source of complaint against him.¹ Warburton's connecting link between the promises of Julian and the descriptions of the attempted realisation of the same by the Church Fathers is a very unsound one, and his whole position appears to be untenable.

(B.) When we turn to the Christian records, we find a strange sameness about all of them. Except that they differ in the number of miracles related, and in the tone of hatred in which they speak of the Apostate, they all assert that the work *was* commenced, that the Jews participated might and main in it, and that a supernatural miracle defeated the impious attempt. Taking them in order of time, we have first the narrative of Gregory Nazianzen,² which, as it is undoubtedly the *fons et*

¹ "Of all persecutions ever made, Julian devised the most inhuman; for he mingled persuasion with tyranny, grudging his victims the glory of martyrdom, and casting doubt upon the zeal of the fearless." Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* XXI. 32.

² Gregory was a fellow-student at the University of Athens with Julian. His *Invective* against Julian, from which this extract (beginning of 2nd book) is taken, is in two books, and was written very shortly after

origo of all later accounts, deserves to be transcribed in full. After the usual amount of violent abuse that characterises his invective against Julian, he continues, "After having run through a course of other tyrannical experiments against the faith, and growing tired of them all as trifling and contemptible, he at last brought down the whole body of the Jews upon us: whom, for their ancient love of sedition and an inveterate hatred of the Christian name, he chose as the fittest instruments of his purpose. These, under a show of great good-will, which hid his real purpose, he endeavoured to convince from their sacred books and traditions that the time foretold in them was now arrived when they should return to their own land, rebuild their Temple, and restore everything to its former splendour. Having thus deceived them with false hopes (for it is easy to be deceived when our passions are flattered), the Jews set upon the work of rebuilding with great vigour, and advanced the project with diligent labour. Suddenly they were driven from their work by a violent earthquake and whirlwind, and they flew together for refuge to a certain neighbouring church, many to escape the impending danger, and others being carried along by the dense crowd in its flight. There are some who say that the church doors were closed against them by an

Julian's death. For a description of the style of the book, see Preface to King's translation (Bohn's *Classical Library*). The following may give some idea of Gregory's feelings towards Julian, and enable us to judge in how far his testimony is to be relied upon: "The leopard cannot change its spots, nor the Moor his skin, nor fire its burning, nor the Evil One his malice, nor Julian his wickedness." "Constantius, in sparing Julian when a youth, was guilty of a sad error." The following translation is by Rendall (p. 220), of a passage where Gregory rises to poetry to pour out his torrent of bitterness against Julian:—

"Mid all that swell the persecutor's line,
Early or late or in the after time,
Latest yet first, pre-eminence is *thine*,
Slayer of souls, Satan's foul sink of crime,
Tyrant accursed!"

The evidence of such a partisan seems to lose all weight after this. Cp. Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, I., p. 707 sq.

invisible hand, although these doors had been wide open a moment before—which hand was accustomed to work these wonders for the confusion of the impious and the comfort of godly men. It is, moreover, affirmed and believed by all, that as they strove to force their way in by violence, the fire, which burst from the foundations of the Temple, met and stopped them; some it burnt and destroyed; others it injured seriously, leaving them a living monument of the Divine wrath against sinners. Thus it happened, and let no man disbelieve it, or the other mighty works of God. But still, the most wondrous thing was that a light appeared in the heavens, as of a cross within a circle Nay, further, they who were present and were witnesses of the following miracle, still show the mark of the cross that was impressed upon their garments. For 'whenever these men, whether they were of us or strangers, were showing these marks, or attending to others who were showing them, each observed on his own or his neighbour's body or on his robe a shining mark, which in art and elegance surpassed all painting and embroidery. Most of them ran to our priests, begging to be baptised, and humbly entreating their mercy.'

Such is the description by the only person who wrote his account within a year after the supposed miracles occurred, and who might well have been able to ascertain the truth of it all. It is hardly necessary to follow in the footsteps of Warburton, Milman, Gibbon, Newman and even of Graetz, who labour to explain away these miracles as being nothing more than natural phenomena,¹ because

¹ It is only to be expected that Gibbon should deny any miraculous agency in this narrative: but that Cardinal Newman should agree with him is certainly remarkable. In his *Essays on the Miracles in Early Ecclesiastical History* (Oxf., 1842), he argues from the "cumulative evidence" of the Church Fathers, and whilst explaining away the crosses on the garments, like Warburton, as being of a phosphoric nature, the cross in the air a meteoric phenomenon, the earthquake and balls of fire of a volcanic character, he asserts that the occasion of the occurrence is the miraculous part of it.

the narrative itself does not appear to merit the ingenuity spent upon it. In the first place, the orthodox Gregory attaches more importance to the miracle of the cross in the sky than to the earthquake which stopped the work ; he finds more wonder in the mark on the robes than in the fire that issued from the church. Apart from the circumstance that will be dealt with next, that no two narratives of the Church historians are in complete harmony with each other, it will be observed that Gregory describes these events with many a "they say," and "as some affirm," his narrative being based on hearsays and mere rumours. The utter improbability of the whole tale is so palpable as to need none of the elaborate defence of Warburton and others. As I venture to consider the whole of Gregory's elaborate statement as a pure fiction, I will not dwell upon the suggestion that has been hazarded that the miraculous fire issuing from the church took the form of fire-balls hurled by the church keepers upon the Jewish crowd in whose faces they had shut the doors,¹ nor seek for subterranean passages, beneath the Temple where inflammable gas was generated, and which was the cause of the fire bursting from the ruins.²

Moreover, the historical assertions of Gregory are not worthy of credit as a whole, owing to his violent partisan spirit. If we accept this narrative about the Temple, why should we not believe him when he tells us that Julian killed men and women by the score for his sacrifices, the Orontes being choked up by the numbers of dead bodies thrown into it by the bloodthirsty heathen monarch ; that as boys, Julian and his brother Gallus wished to build a tower over the sepulchre of the martyr, Mamas, and that whilst the work of Gallus was successful, as soon as Julian's

¹ This cynical explanation is offered by King in his notes to his translation of the *Invective*.

² Milman, in his *History of the Jews*, vol. III., and his notes to Gibbon, labours hard to prove this ; so also Guizot and Graetz. For an account of a similar subterranean explosion, cp. Josephus, *Antiq. of the Jews*, XVI. vii. 1.

portion of it reached a fair height, a Divine miracle caused it to fall to the ground each time he recommenced it;¹ that once when Julian was taking part in a Pagan ceremonial, the devil appeared to him, and the Emperor forgetful of his apostasy, made the sign of the cross and the Evil One disappeared;² if, I say, we hesitate to believe these and other fictions, how can we possibly be more ready to credit his tale about the Temple building? Whoever reads the *Invective* against Julian that this Church Father indited, will be amazed by the many superstitious tales and undiluted falsehoods that he brings against Julian in order to blacken his character. Gregory knew that the Emperor had intended to raise the Temple again, and he invented this legend in order to strike a note of triumph at his imaginary defeat, which in reality was only caused by his early death, before steps had been initiated to realise his promise to the Jews.

This tale by Gregory was soon spread right and left, and the so-called substantiations of it by later writers are practically worthless. They all slavishly copy him, but evolve from their inner consciousness new wonders that they fancy will improve the legend. Thus it is that Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, some twenty-five years later, in his zeal in persecuting the Jews,³ writes to the Emperor Theodosius: "Have you not heard how when Julian gave command to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem, the workmen

¹ This legend is repeated by Sozomen (book V. 2), Theodoret (book III. 2), and is utilised by Ibsen in his play.

² One of Gregory's warmest defenders, La Bleterie (*Vie de Julien*, p. 349) observes, "Ce qu'on ne doit pas sans doute prendre à la lettre," and Lardner (*Jewish and Heathen Test.*, IV., p. 33), "A man who talks in that manner, minds not what he says, and cannot be supposed to regard truth in his words."

³ V. Graetz, IV., p. 386. Theodosius had issued a command for a synagogue that had been destroyed by Christian rioters to be rebuilt, and Ambrose is enraged at this impiety of the Emperor, and addresses his 40th Epistle to him in rebuke thereof.

were destroyed by a fire sent by God?"¹ Chrysostom² observes in a sermon (the third) against the Jews,³ that the wicked Julian lent his aid to the work of rebuilding the Temple, out of his enmity to Christianity, but a fire bursting from the foundations drove away and dispersed all concerned in the undertaking. The foundation stones, which were left unfinished, are still to be seen.⁴

This was written from Antioch at the same time as Bishop Ambrose addressed his epistle from North Italy to the Court at Rome, and the relation of both these narratives to that of Gregory is obvious enough to justify the conclusion that they had simply caught up the legend spread abroad by the Nazianzene Church Father, and repeated it in almost identical language.

In the following century, some seventy or eighty years after the demise of Julian, during which period the diatribe of Gregory against that Emperor must have been in the hands of all Church writers, four ecclesiastical annalists narrate at length the Temple legend, with sundry embellishments of their own. Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Rufinus all tell the story as derived from Gregory, but, vary considerably in the number and quality of the miracles connected therewith. Socrates informs us that Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, prophesied the failure of the attempt, and the very next night occurred the terrible earthquake; it overthrew many buildings, and fire came down from

¹ Non audisti, Imperator, quia cum jussisset Julianus reparari Templum Hierosolymis, quod divino qui faciebant repagulum igne flagrarunt.

² John Chrysostom delivered six Orations against the Jews between the years 366—387. V. Graetz, *ib.*; Mosheim, I. (ed. Soames), p. 325; Art. in Smith and Wace, *Christ. Biogr.* I.

³ Chrysostom also refers to Julian's rebuilding in *De S. Babyla*, and *Hom.* IV., in *Matthæum*.

⁴ Chrysostom's evidence is greatly discounted by the many fables that disfigure his works. His hostility to the Jews is well known; cp. Gibbon, c. XXXII. He reports (*Homilia* II. in *Judeos*) a revolt of the Jews, and an attempt by them to rebuild the Temple in 315 A.D. under Constantine—a statement of which Milman says there is no other trace in history. V. Milman's *Hist. of the Jews*, III., note on p. 14 (5th ed.).

heaven and consumed all the hammers, saws, axes, and other tools. The conduct of the Jews, when permission to restore the Temple had been granted them, became most insolent and overbearing. They threatened the Christians with the same treatment they had themselves previously experienced. Sozomen relates that Julian and the Jews neglected everything else to push on the work; they engaged the most skilful artisans, and the women sold their daintiest ornaments and carried baskets of earth in order to accomplish their desired end. When suddenly the earthquake occurred, huge stones were thrown up from the old foundations, public porticoes, especially those in which Jews were collected looking on at the work, fell to the ground, and many were killed. In spite of this the work was progressed with, when a fire, either from the bowels of the earth or from a neighbouring church, broke out, and blazing all the day forced the work to cease. The spades and baskets used were of silver, says Theodoret. The Jews offered all their wealth to the work, and innumerable multitudes began to dig. Letters were sent by the Jews to all their coreligionists in every part of the globe to come and help. But all the earth they removed in the daytime spontaneously returned during the night to its former location.¹ They destroyed everything that remained of the old Temple, and while they were gathering heaps of clay and plaster, violent storms and an earthquake occurred. This struck the Jews with terror, but they continued their work until a fire broke out in their midst. That same night the roof of the building, beneath which many of the workmen slept collapsed, and all were killed. Rufinus has nothing to say about any fire, but his earthquake throws down all the adjoining edifices, and destroys especially those buildings in which Jews were assembled. The crosses on the garments, Socrates relates, shone like the

¹ *νύκτωρ δὲ ὁ χοῦς αὐτομάτως ἀπὸ τῆς φάραγγος μετεπιθετο* (Book III. 15). This Theodoret (b. 387) also wrote treatises against the Jews that have been lost. *F. Migne, Series Græce, vol. LXXXII, p. 1111.*

sunbeams even during the night, and could not be rubbed off. Sozomen knows that stars were seen on the clothes, and they were so skilfully formed that the hand of a workman could not have done them better.¹ Black was the colour of the crosses, says Theodoret. As will have been noticed, some relate that the fire fell from heaven,² others from the earth, others again from a neighbouring church, and one is silent upon this matter altogether. According to Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, Julian summoned the Jews to know why they offered no sacrifices.³ Upon their informing him that this could only be done in Jerusalem, he forthwith issued commands that the Temple should be rebuilt.

The effect of these miracles upon the Jews is differently estimated by the Church writers. Gregory attributes many conversions to these divine manifestations, whilst Socrates inveighs against the obstinacy of men who could, even after these wonders, still deny "that Christ was God." Sozomen knew of Gentiles who joined many Jews in accepting the Christian belief, whilst Theodoret relates that the Jews openly confessed the guilt of their ancestors in crucifying Jesus; but, nevertheless, stubbornly refused to accept baptism.

In spite of all Warburton's ingenuity, the many discrepancies between these several accounts cannot be reconciled. The four annalists here named are never relied upon for authentic statements, particularly in reference to ecclesiastical miracles, and there appears to be no reason why their Temple miracles are to be placed in a different

¹ This writer asserts he derived his information from eye-witnesses—a statement that is considerably discounted by its recurrence in connection with so many worthless legends.

² Cp. Julian's remark in his work against Christianity, "Fire does not come down from the heaven in our times as it did in those of Moses, Elijah the Tishbite and Abraham," p. 1034.

³ Julian's knowledge of the Old Testament pointed out *supra* is sufficient answer to the statement of the Church Fathers about this interview and question.

category. Gibbon rightly says that "the subsequent witnesses, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Philostorgius, etc., add contradictions, rather than authority"—and the "cumulative evidence" upon which Newman bases his belief in the truth of this incident, is totally unreliable.

Later Church historians embellish the legend still more. Philostorgius¹ (end of fifth century) and Theophanes² (end of sixth century) "clap on a couple of senseless lies" (Warburton). The first tells that whilst the workmen were digging, a cave was laid open beneath the foundation-stone. A rope was lowered, and one of the Jews clambered down it for a long distance until he reached the bottom, where he found a copy of the Gospel of John, written in Hebrew. (How it came there beneath the foundation stone, when the Temple was rebuilt in the days of Ezra and in the time of Herod, our historian does not state.) This legend, which appears to have as much truth in it as that of Gregory, is copied by Nicephorus³ (c. 1320), and the Church annalist, Theophanes, is not satisfied with the crosses being stamped on the garments of the Jerusalem Jews, but knows that they were found in Antioch (some 270 miles away) and in other cities. They were also impressed upon the coverings of altars, on the Church books, and sacred vestments. Upon these two fabulists, Warburton quietly observes, "I fancy Philostorgius would have been puzzled to produce his miraculous gospel. Yet, I make no question, Theophanes knew where to find enough of his manufacture of the cross to save him from blushing, had he been of so weak a complexion."

As an instance of how the tale grew in the course of centuries, George Kedrenus (c. 1060) in his *Historiarum Compendium*,⁴ narrates that, in the sky, appeared an im-

¹ B. 364. His history is extant only in an abridgment by Photius. The Temple legends are related in book VII. 9 to 14.

² In p. 80 of his *Chronographia*, ed. by J. Classen, Bonn, 1839.

³ *Ecclesiastic. Hist.*, book X.; Migne, Series Græco-Lat., vol. CXLVI.

⁴ Vol. I., pp. 530—539. Ed. by J. Bekker, Bonn, 1838.

mense cross, stretching from Golgotha to Mount Olivet, a distance of about 600 yards, and that the crosses were also found on the clothes of Christians. Whenever a Jew or a Greek wished to deny this miracle, these crosses suddenly burst into flame to give them the lie direct.

These accounts are so contradictory, from Gregory to Kedrenus, and so full of absurd miracles, that no historical fact can be based upon them. The origin of them all is the legend given, among many other equally credible ones, in Gregory's *Invective*. None of them have any independent source to draw upon, and we are obliged to conclude that the evidence of the ecclesiastical writers, so far from being cumulative, is in every way untrustworthy, and of little weight in this inquiry. Gregory started the tale of the miracles, and the chorus of Church writers, even to this day, has echoed and re-echoed it until it has passed into the domain of history, into which it ought never to have entered.

(c.) We now approach an authority of much greater importance than any of the Church chroniclers, a writer who, if Gibbon is to be believed, confirms the incident by his "unexceptionable testimony." The narrative of Ammian Marcellinus,¹ who was a personal friend of Julian, and a sympathiser in his Pagan reaction, is strangely similar to that of his antithesis, Gregory Nazianzen. The account by the heathen historian runs as follows:—"Turning his attention to every quarter, and being desirous of immortalising his reign by the greatness of his achievements, Julian projected to re-build, at an enormous expense, the once magnificent Temple at Jerusalem, which, after many deadly combats during the siege by

¹ See his life and accounts of his history by Prof. Ramsay, in Smith's *Diet. of Greek and Roman Biography*. The doubts once raised as to his religion have now been settled, and it is generally acknowledged that although he was not very hostile to Christianity, and could even speak a word in praise of it, he was a heathen. Gibbon is extremely fond of him, lauds his impartiality, and even overlooks his many faults in his reliance upon him.

Vespasian, had been taken and destroyed by Titus. He entrusted the work to Alypius of Antioch, who had formerly been a pro-prefect in Britain. When Alypius, assisted by the governor of the province, applied himself vigorously to this work, fearful balls of fire, bursting out again and again, near the foundation, rendered the place altogether inaccessible to the workmen, who were scorched by the flames. And thus the very elements, as if by some fate, repelling the attempt, it was laid aside."¹

This account was written fully *twenty* years after the event it describes, that is, about the same time as the Oration of John Chrysostom, which it strongly resembles. Both Ammian and Chrysostom were in Antioch when they wrote their accounts of this supposed Temple miracle, and both seem to derive their information from Gregory's *Invective*, which, be it remembered, was written very shortly after these events were said to have taken place. Does it not, therefore, appear reasonable to conclude that Ammian learned the news from public rumour, that had spread it like wildfire through the instrumentality of Gregory? Certainly our heathen author does not impute any miraculous agency to the "fearful balls of fire"—he is a heathen, not a Christian. Ammian indeed borrowed many facts, as well as legends, from ecclesiastical works.² It

¹ Et licet accidentium varietatem sollicitate mente præcipientes multiplicatos expeditionis apparatus flagranti studio perurgeret; diligentiam tamen ubique dividens imperique sui memoriam magnitudine operum gestiens propagare, ambitiosum quondam apud Hierosolymam templum, quod post multa et interneciva certamina, obsidente Vespasiano posteaque Tito, ægre est expugnatum, instaurare sumtibus cogitabat immodicis; negotiumque maturandum Alypio dederat Antiochensi, qui olim Britannias curaverat pro Præfectis. Cum itaque rei idem fortiter instaret Alypius, juvaretque provinciæ Rector, metuendi globi flammarum prope fundamenta crebris assultibus erumpentes, fecere locum exustis aliquoties operantibus inaccessum; hocque modo elemento destinatus repellente, cessavit inceptum. Book XXIII., 1.

² Cp. Lardner, *Jew and Heathen Test.*, vol. IV., c. xlv. His knowledge of Christian customs is extensive. Martyrdom for the faith he calls *mors gloriosa*, and many of his statements are to be found in Church histories of an earlier date.

will be noted that in his narrative, no mention whatsoever is made of the Jews; the whole work is entrusted to Alypius, a Pagan, at the sole expense of Julian, and the Jews appear to have no interest or connection in any way with the enterprise. Even Gibbon, though inclined, as a rule, to believe Ammian, more than hints that his version of the affair is only the result of a desire to adorn his history by some miracle at the expense of plain truth. Warburton, in defending Ammian, asks whether this writer would have recorded an event that "discredited his religion and the Emperor he idolised." Any reader of Ammian will see that he is not afraid of blaming Julian, or of pointing out his many weaknesses.¹ Ammian is by no means free from the superstitions of his time,² and describes incidents and relates tales which he will have the reader to believe are perfectly true. As an instance of this, the following is narrated with all the solemnity of recording some real event:³ "When the wild geese leave the East because of the heat, to seek a Western climate, as soon as they arrive at Mount Taurus, where dwell numbers of eagles, being afraid of these warlike birds, they stop up their own beaks with stones, that not even the hardest necessity may draw a cry from them. They then fly more rapidly than usual across the range of mountains, and when they have passed it, they throw away the stones, and proceed more securely."

¹ Cf. Book XXV. 4.

² Prof. Ramsay (*s. v.*, Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.*) thus describes him: "Although sufficiently acute in detecting and exposing the follies of others, and especially in ridiculing the absurdities of popular superstition, Ammian did not entirely escape the contagion. The general and deep-seated belief in magic spells, omens, prodigies and oracles, which appear to have gained additional strength upon the first introduction of Christianity, evidently exercised no small influence over his mind." He relates that in Egypt there were many kinds of serpents, one of them being a species of reptile that had a head at each end of its body, and was called "walking-both-ways" (*amphisbæna*). Other absurd tales are also to be found scattered throughout his history.

³ Book XVIII., 3. The tale is prefaced by the following words which attest Ammian's belief in it: *Animalia ratione carentia salutem suam interdum alto tueri silentio solent, ut exemptum est hoc perquam notum.*

Ammian also believes the story that on two occasions the Genius of the Empire appeared in dreams to Julian to warn him of his doom,—narrating these legends with all the air of their being truthful history. When a writer can insert such tales in his annals, his credibility becomes at once open to question, and the line of demarcation to be drawn between fact and fiction becomes very shadowy. Returning to our present subject then, it seems more than probable that Ammian knew of the Emperor's intention to rebuild the Temple, and had also been informed that the work was to be entrusted to Alypius. This is not surprising, as we find Julian speaking of Alypius in the most cordial terms.¹ Anxious to know what had been the ultimate outcome of this proposed rebuilding, as nothing had resulted from it when he was writing down his history some twenty years later, is it not natural that, ready as he always was to believe the marvellous, he should have borrowed the legend that Gregory had set afloat and added it to his history? Just as Ammian could never have seen the wild geese of which he speaks, so he learnt about the Temple only from hearsay, and in his love for recording strange and extraordinary events he gave a place to Gregory's miracles in his work, stripping them, however, of their purely Christian aspect.²

(D.) The final evidence brought by Warburton to prove that the Temple building was providentially hindered after it had already been begun, is taken from Jewish sources. One of the main difficulties that naturally presents itself to the critic in upholding Warburton's view of the event, is the apparent silence of the people most

¹ The 29th and 30th Epistles of Julian are addressed to Alypius, who is styled "my most beloved and devoted brother."

² The defence of Milman and others of the authenticity of Ammian's narrative totally ignores the fact that Gregory's was earlier by twenty years. Milman plainly states (*Hist. of Jews*, III., note to p. 20, 5th ed.) that Gregory expanded Ammian's description, whereas Gregory's version was widely known before Ammian commenced to write his book.

directly interested in the matter, viz., the Jews. Determined, however, to discover *some* Jewish account of the affair, Christian writers have been most unfortunate in their reliance upon Jewish history, as the testimony they adduce from two Jewish annalists can be shown to be most feeble and untrustworthy. Wagenseil¹ was the first to point out a supposed defence of the usual opinion upon the Temple miracles by a Jew, in the Shalsheth Hak-kabalah of R. Gedalya Ibn Yachya.² We there read the following narrative. "In the days of R. Chanan and his colleagues, in the year 4349 A.M., the Chronicles say that there was a great earthquake throughout the world, and there fell down the great Temple that the Jews had erected in Jerusalem by the order of Julian Apostata the Emperor at a great cost. And next day, a great fire fell from heaven which melted all the iron that was in that building, and burnt an innumerable number of Jews. And when the Emperor Valenti (Valentinian?) saw this, he sent other Jews from Constantinople and built up the ruins."³

Who, reading this, can doubt but that it is a mere repetition of a popular legend, taken bodily from a Christian source? Our author evidently accepted the name "Julian Apostata" without any questioning. No Israelite would have stigmatised Julian as an Apostate from Christianity, but Gedalyah must have thought it an integral

¹ In his anti-Jewish treatise, *Tela ignea Satanæ*, p. 231. Eisenmenger *Entdecktes Jud.*, c. XV., a few years after, repeats the same quotations.

² Ibn Yachya, b. 1515, d. 1587. This "Chain of Tradition," which Graetz, vol. IX., p. 419, characterises as "a confused medley of authentic historical narratives and mere fables," was first printed in Venice, 1587.

³ בימי רב חנן וחביריו שהיה שנת כמו ד' אלפים שמ"ט ליצירה אומרים הקרוניקי שהיה רעש גדול בכל העולם ונפל המקדש הגדול שעשו היהודים בירושלים במצות יוליאון אפוסטטו הקיסר עם הוצאה רבה וביום שאחריו בא מן השמים אש גדול באופן שנתכו כל הברזלים שהיו בבנין ההוא ונשרפו יהודים רבים אין קץ ובראות הקיסר ווילטו כל זרע שלח ונשרפו יהודים רבים אחרים ובנה כל ההרוס: (ed. Amsterdam), p. 88.

part of the Emperor's name and so employed it.¹ Further, the date here given proves that our Rabbi had not been careful in transcribing the story. The Rabbi Chanan,² of whom mention is made, lived about 588 A.D., some two hundred years after Julian. Ibn Yachya seems to imply that the Temple erected by the "Apostate" stood during this lengthy period, and was then destroyed—a confusion of ideas in itself sufficient to demonstrate the unreliability of our Jewish annalist. The Chronicles³ from which he states he derived his information appear to have furnished him with many a strange narrative.⁴ The testimony of the author of the *Chain of Tradition* is therefore of very little weight, as being of non-Jewish origin and totally lacking in even accuracy of transcription.

The second Jewish author adduced by Wagenseil and Eisenmenger as having spoken of Julian's rebuilding of the Temple is R. David Gans.⁵ In his *Zemach David*, under the date of 368 (*sic*), after erroneously alleging that Julian's persecution of the Christians was the most cruel and

¹ Similarly he styles Jerome, ס' ירונימו (Saint Hieronymo), Gregory the Great ס' גרורי'.

² R. Chanan of Iskia, סא"ס קי"א as he is called by Gedalya on p. 27 (ed. Amst.). Gans (*Zemach David*, p. 34b) also gives the date of this R. Chanan as 4349. The year of Julian's death was 4124 A.M. About R. Chanan, cp. Graetz, V., note 3 to p. 386.

³ קרוניקי, an exact transcription of the Latin "chronici," as all the annals of the Middle Ages were styled.

⁴ From the קרוניקי he narrates the life and history of the famous wizard Merlin, also a legendary account of a violent dispute between the medical schools of Hippocrates and Chrysippus. He directly names three Chronicles he utilised; that of Jacob Philip of Bergomen, of St. Iglesia, and of Nicephorus (Calixtes).

⁵ R. David Gans, b. 1541, d. 1613. His *Zemach David* is in two parts: I., comprising Biblical, Talmudical and Rabbinical history; II., Profane history, the last entry being 1592. Another hand has added a supplement, forming part III., in later editions, as far as the year 1692. Bishop Newton (quoted in Duncombe's *Select Works of Julian*, II., p. 62) remarks that the truth of the miracles is upheld by "Ammian, a heathen, and Zemuch, a Jew!"

murderous of any they had suffered,¹ our historian continues, "This emperor commanded that the Temple should be rebuilt with great splendour, and gave thereto much money of his own; but he was hindered by Divine agency from ever completing the building, for he was killed in the Persian war, in the year [4]127, 367 A.D., in the second year of his reign. . . . This happened in the days of Rabina and Rab Ashi."²

Gans distinctly gives his authorities³ for these assertions, which like those of Ibn Yachya, are Christian. It is noteworthy that he knows nothing of the earthquake and the fire, and simply records the attempt of Julian, which was frustrated by his early death. So far, then, from this author serving as a support for the truth of the Christian legends of the providential cessation of the work by means of wondrous signs and portents, our Rabbi's evidence simply bears out the contention upheld throughout this article, and, if anything, disproves the usually accepted view. The history of Gans is remarkable for its general exactness and credibility, an especial feature in it being the absence of all fables and legendary matter. Without any attempt at style, his annals are a dry, succinct record of events, based upon the works of Christian writers. The statements of this sixteenth century historian cannot be regarded as the *Jewish* version of the Gregorian legend.

1 צוה להשמיד להרוג ולאבד כל מאמיני דת נוצרי לשרשם ולעקרם ולפגונו ולאחריו לא היה קיסר אשר השמיד והכחיד את הנוצרים כמוהו :
 2 הקיסר הזה צוה לחדש בנין בית המקדש לכבוד ולתפארת ונתן לזה עזר ממונו אך מן השמים נתעכב שלא נגמר בנינו כי הקיסר נהרג במלחמת פרס בשנת קכ"ז שס"ז לנוצרים שנייה למלכותו—ביוניסני דף ס"ב וקאעססיוס ס' ס"ד—והיה זה בימי רבינא ורב אשי :

³ Vinting, p. 62, and Cassius, c. XXIV. These are the names of two obscure German chroniclers. Gans may have found these authors in the Protestant Church history, called the *Magdeburg Centuries*, which was finished in 1574. Other writers named by Gans (Preface to part II.) are Cyriacus Spangenburg, Laurentius Faustus, Hubertus Valesius (Hubert de Valois), Martin Boreck, etc. V. Karpeles, *Jüd. Literatur*, p. 991, and Zunz, *Ges. Schrift.* I. 185.

It seems difficult to account for the fact that all Christian writers, from Wagenseil downwards, have overlooked the notice of this legend by a Jewish annalist of an earlier date than either Ibn Yachya or David Gans. It may be, as will be observed, that this omission is due to the hopeless and absurd manner in which the tale has been confused by this author, whose version of it differs from that of every one else. In that section of his chronicle (*Yochasin*, written in 1504),¹ which treats of universal history, Abraham Zacuto thus relates the legend (Part V. Period 7): "And Julian came to the throne, and, after vanquishing the Persians, died in the year 366 (*sic*); and after him reigned Jovian, who died in the same year. Then Valentiani (Valentinian) came to the throne, and he commanded that Jerusalem should be rebuilt. He assisted the enterprise by large subsidies from his own treasury; and during his days there occurred a great earthquake accompanied by lightning, and the stones fell down."²

The original story is almost totally lost in this scarcely recognisable version; but there can be little doubt that Zacuto is narrating the same legend, with peculiar variations, as Ibn Yachya, Gans, and Ammian Marcellinus. Strangely enough, Ibn Yachya also makes the Emperor Valentinian (reigned 364-375) take part in the Temple building—an assertion that is altogether without foundation. The transference from Julian to Valentinian—of the whole, according to Zacuto, or of part, if we follow Ibn Yachya—of this pseudo-historical narrative, is a striking illustration of the manner in which Gregory's legend became distorted whilst passing through the hands of different writers. Neither of the three Jewish chroniclers—Zacuto Ibn Yachya, or Gans, to name them in their chronological

¹ V. Graetz, IX., p. 17. According to Zunz, *Ges. Schrift.* I. 178, the *Yochasin* (Genealogies) was written in 1502.

י וימלך גואלינו וינצח את הפרסיים וימת שנת שס"ו וימלוך יואנו ומת בשנה ההיא וימלוך ואלגיטיאנו והוא צוה לבנות ירושלים ונתן עזר להוצאה מממונו והונו לבנינו ובימיו היה רעש גדול וברקים ונפלו אבנים:

order—drew their information upon the Gregorian legend from Jewish sources, and no independent Jewish statement upon the subject has yet been discovered.¹

Having now dealt with each of the arguments relative to this inquiry, let us now survey the position of the whole question. On the one side, maintaining the truth of the Temple miracles, we find Gregory Nazianzen, the originator of the tale, followed by Ammian, and improved upon by the numerous Church annalists, whose accounts vary considerably.

The supposed testimony of Julian himself and of the Jewish authorities cannot be entertained, as they are of value neither *pro* nor *con*. On the other hand, denying that the projected scheme ever proceeded further than the *promise* to rebuild the Temple, there is the famous Twenty-fifth Epistle, and Julian's comment upon his promise in an Oration, whilst the Jewish contemporary writers have nought to say about it. The earliest Jewish reference is of the sixteenth century, and that too is based on Christian authority. The silence of many important Church writers of that and the following epoch further casts a strong doubt upon the veracity of the Gregorian tale. Jerome,² the author of the Vulgate, was a young man when Julian died. He was a pupil of Gregory Nazianzen, had travelled through Palestine, lived for some time in Bethlehem, and was a personal acquaintance of Rufinus, the historian. From neither of these ecclesiastics does he appear to have heard anything of the Temple miracles, though both have

¹ One of the earliest Hebrew historians, Abraham Ibn Daud of Pousquiers, has the following note on Julian in his *Sefer Hakkabalah* (written in 1161; *v. Graetz*, VI., p. 183):—ימלך תחתיו יוליאן קיסר שנתים ושש—וימלך לעבודת הצלמים כמשפט הראשון ולא שמע לתורת אדום וימת וימלך תחתיו ונז'. Here we have simply a record of Julian's adoption of paganism, and nothing even of his friendship for the Jews. R. Joseph Ha-Cohen (flourished c. 1530), in his *Emek Ha-bacha*, speaks of the attempt in Trajan's time to rebuild the Temple, but is silent upon Julian.

² See *Life of Saint Jerome*, by A. Thierry, 1867, and Art. in Smith and Wace's *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, vol. III.

recorded them. Throughout Jerome's voluminous writings, references to Julian and to the Jewish Temple are very frequent; and yet there is a complete silence about the miracles. In commenting upon the verse of Daniel, mentioned above,¹ which he avers was applied by the Jews to the Pagan Emperor, Jerome adds, "Julian pretended to love the Jews, and promised to offer sacrifices in their Temple."² How easily could such a statement, apparently derived from the "Epistle to the Community of the Jews," have served as a preface to a repetition of the Gregorian legend—had but Jerome known of or believed it! At all times Jerome is more deserving of credit than the majority of ecclesiastical writers, and his support of the view here upheld is most valuable. Newman's explanation of Jerome's silence, "that the very notoriety of a fact leads to its being passed over,"³ is hardly plausible with reference to an author who was a most observant recorder of events, and intimately acquainted with the Jews. In his numerous allusions to Julian and the Temple at Jerusalem, not all the notoriety in the world can account for his omission to relate the news that his teacher Gregory had so diligently spread abroad.⁴

Similarly, the Christian poet Prudentius⁵ (born 348), whilst speaking of the Temple and of the Apostate Emperor, knows nothing of Gregory's legends; even Orosius, who does not paint Julian in the fairest of colours, and asserts that upon departing for the Persian War he ordered the restoration of the amphitheatre at Jerusalem, in which upon his return he would cast

¹ Note 4 on p. 625.

² *Judæos amare se simulans et in templo eorum immolaturum se esse promittens.*

³ *Essays on Eccl. Miracles*, VII., note to page 340.

⁴ The following observation of Gibbon is more reasonable than Newman's, "The silence of Jerome leads to a suspicion that the same story which was celebrated at a distance, might be despised on the spot."

⁵ Cf. Mosheim, book II., part. II., c. II.; and Art. in Smith and Wace's *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, IV.

many bishops and monks to the wild beasts,¹ is silent about any Temple restoration. Most surprising of all, neither of the two Cyrils, the Bishop of Jerusalem or of Alexandria, has left a word upon the subject. Cyril of Jerusalem² was Bishop of that city when the rebuilding of the Temple is reported to have been undertaken. He died in 386, and in his numerous lectures, Julian's attempt is not even hinted at. That the extant works of Cyril all date before 363 is quite true; but had so noteworthy an event happened in his own see, surely he would have been the first to record it, especially as we possess a letter that he sent in 351 to the Emperor Constantius reporting the appearance of a luminous cross in the sky. Gregory tells us that a similar cross appeared at the enforced cessation of the Temple-building, yet Cyril writes nothing about it, and no critic has alleged that any of Cyril's works are lost. Gregory is not known to have ever visited or lived in Jerusalem, whilst Cyril was born in the Holy City, was appointed deacon in the church of his native town at the age of twenty, and passed every year of his life there. Cyril's complete silence is therefore more eloquent than all Gregory's violent denunciations of his imperial enemy.

Cyril of Alexandria, throughout all his polemic against Julian, his comments upon his opponent's views of the Temple worship and the Jews, never once speaks of even an intention on Julian's part to raise the sanctuary of Israel from its ruins. This Bishop was a contemporary of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, but intimate as he must have been with all Julian's writings and doings, and eager as he always is to find a point of attack against the heathen

¹ Book VII. 30. Warburton is wrong in asserting (p. 150) that Orosius speaks of the Temple building.

² It is this Cyril who, according to Socrates, prophesied the failure of Julian's plan for restoring Jerusalem. For his life and works, v. Mosheim (ed. Soames), p. 324, and Art. in Smith and Wace, I., and Newman, *Library of the Fathers*, II. 1 (Preface).

monarch, he makes not the faintest allusion to the miracles of Gregory and their cause.

The Syrian monk, who some 140 years after Julian's death collected the many legends current about this Emperor, and was certainly not friendly towards Julian, speaks, like Jerome, of Julian's promise to the Jews, but knows no more.¹

The negative evidence of these ecclesiastical authorities undoubtedly possesses great weight. That they should have maintained silence about an event calculated to enhance the glory of their religion is certainly a phenomenon, and in my mind sufficient to disprove the evidence of men like Gregory, and even Ammian, who had less opportunity of ascertaining the truth.

A contention utilised by Lardner should also be thrown into the scale of evidence against the truth of the usually accepted view. Julian was about to embark upon a costly war, similar to that in which a Roman army under Crassus had before met with overwhelming disaster. Was it likely that he would set apart huge sums, as asserted by the Church annalists, to satisfy a mere caprice, or to favour the Jews, just at the time when the whole resources of the Roman Empire were being strained to meet the enormous expenses of the approaching war with Sapor, King of Persia? The extreme improbability of this outlay being sanctioned on the eve of a great war seems to strengthen the views here set forth, since, as Gibbon clearly points out,² the Empire at this period was far from possessing great wealth.

The evidence on both sides has here been passed under review, and the candid verdict upon the whole question appears to be that Julian, in his friendship for the Jews, or out of enmity to Christianity perhaps, contemplated the restoration of the Holy City and its sanctuary, but postponed the realisation of this plan until his return from

¹ *V. supra*, note 2 on page 621.

² *Decline and Fall*, end of c. XVII.

Persia, whence he never came back. Nothing should be admitted into the book of history except that which, by reason of its undisputed truth, merits a place in its sacred pages; and it is time that the legends, for such I esteem them to be, of the reputed rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem by the Emperor Julian, and the attendant miracles, should be relegated to their proper sphere of imaginative literature and fictitious history.

MICHAEL ADLER.
